

VOL. I. (XX.)  
1874

[THIRD SERIES.]

NO. II. (CXVI.)  
FEBRUARY.

# THE MONTH

AND

CATHOLIC REVIEW.



LONDON:  
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.  
BURNS AND OATES.

DUBLIN: W. H. SMITH AND SON; W. B. KELLY; M'GLASHAN AND GILL.

GLASGOW: H. MARCEY. BRUSSELS: V. DEVAUX. PARIS: A. XAVIER.

BALTIMORE: KELLY AND PIET. NEW YORK: P. O'SHEA.

---

Price Two Shillings.

*All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.*

### NOTICE ON THE NEW SERIES.

THE Managers of the *Month*, in accordance with their announcement made some time ago, are now able to resume the monthly publication of their *Review*, in a larger size and with a prospect, as they hope, of greater usefulness to the Catholic cause than before. The monthly numbers will be slightly smaller in size and price than the double numbers lately issued, and will form *three* volumes annually. The price per annum will be exactly that of the ordinary Quarterly Reviews.

DEC. 22nd, 1873.

## ST. JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY, 50, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

### TERMS.

#### I. For Subscribers who pay in advance :

Two Shillings .....	1 Vol.	at a time for a Month.
Six Shillings .....	3 Vols.	„ for One Quarter.
	or 1 Vol.	„ for Half a Year.
Half a Guinea .....	3 Vols.	„ for Half a Year.
	or 1 Vol.	„ for a Year.
One Guinea .....	3 Vols.	„ for a Year.
	In the Country 4 Vols.	„ for a Year.
Five Guineas (for Families in the country or Depôts in town or country) ...	25 Vols.	„ for a year.

#### II. For Casual Readers who pay in advance :

Threepence—1 Vol. at a time.

#### III. For all who do not pay in advance :

Sixpence for 1 Vol. at a time, and Postage Expenses incurred in recovering Arrears.

*Books can be changed every Three Days.*

### CATHOLIC BOOK CLUBS.

FOR the convenience of Catholics residing in the country, the Managers of St. Joseph's Library are willing to make arrangements for *Catholic Book Clubs*, by means of which three or four families can combine their subscriptions, and enjoy the advantage of a greater variety of books at the same time. Terms can be ascertained by communication with the Managers, at the above address.

### REGISTERS FOR GOVERNESSES, AND OTHERS REQUIRING SITUATIONS.

The Managers of St. Joseph's Library have also for some time opened a Register for Catholic Governesses, and are in constant communication with families seeking the services of such ladies. They also receive the names of servants wanting employment, and keep a list of vacant situations. *No fees whatever are charged, except for postage.*







## BOOKS FOR LENT.

**The History of the Sacred Passion.** By Father LUIS DE LA PALMA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. New Edition. Price 7s. 6d. [*In the Press.*]

A work long held in great and just repute in Spain. It opens a mine of wealth to one's soul. Though there are many works on the Passion in English, probably none will be found so generally useful both for spiritual reading and meditation. We desire to see it widely circulated.—*Tablet.*

A sterling work of the utmost value, proceeding from the pen of a great theologian, whose piety was as simple and tender as his learning and culture were profound and exquisite. It is a rich storehouse for contemplation on the great mystery of our Redemption and one of those books which every Catholic ought to read for himself.—*Weekly Register.*

The most wonderful work upon the Passion that we have ever read. To us the charm lies in this, that it is entirely theological. It is made use of largely by those who give the Exercises of St. Ignatius. It is, as it were, the flesh upon the skeleton of the exercises. Never has the Passion been meditated upon so before. . . . If any one wishes to understand the Passion of our Lord in its fulness, let him procure this book.—*Dublin Review.*

We have not read a more thoughtful work on our Blessed Lord's Passion. It is a complete storehouse of matter for meditation, and for sermons on that Divine mystery.—*Catholic Opinion.*

**Vita Vitæ Nostræ, Meditantibus, Proposita.** By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. Cloth, 7s. 6d.; calf, 10s. 6d.

**Rodriguez on Christian Perfection.** For the Laity. 2 vols. cloth, 6s. Also in calf and morocco.

**Manresa; or, the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.** 3s.

**Meditations of St. Anselm.** A New Translation. By M. R. With Preface by His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. Price 5s.

**The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and other Principal Saints.** Compiled from original monuments and other authentic records. Illustrated with the remarks of judicious modern critics and historians. By the REV. ALBAN BUTLER. 4 vols. 8vo. £1 10s.

**Meditations on the Sufferings of Christ.** By SISTER EMMERICH. New and complete edition. With Preface and Life. Price 3s. 6d.

**Treatises and Meditations on the Passion.** By ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, 3s.; cheap edition, 2s. Clock of the Passion. By the same. Cloth 9d.

**The Student of Jesus Crucified.** 1s.

**Mary in Sorrow and Desolation.** 1s.

**Meditations and Contemplations on the Passion.** Translated by a SISTER OF MERCY, Coventry. Cloth, 2s.

**Reflections on the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ.** Compiled and translated from the French by a RELIGIOUS OF Loretto Convent, Navan. Second Edition. Revised. Price, wrapper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.

**Clifton Tracts for Holy Week, viz.,** "Palm Sunday, or the Procession," ½d.; "Maundy Thursday, or the Holy Sepulchre," 1d.; "Good Friday, or the Adoration of the Cross," 1d.

**Meditations for Each Day of the Year, on the Life of Our Saviour.** By a Father of the Society of Jesus. New and Improved Edition. 2 vols. cloth, 9s.; calf, 16s.; morocco, 17s.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

## BOOKS FOR LENT.

**Passion of Jesus and Woes of Mary.** The Lent Book of the Oratory, 2d. Meditations on the Passion, 1d.; with account of the Scapular, 2d. Stations of the Cross (from Golden Manual), 1d. By Dr. PAGANI, 2d.; by St. ALPHONSUS, 1d. The Stations of the Cross. By the Rev. H. FORMBY. Fourteen engravings, wrapper, 4d.; cloth, neat, 1s. The Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin, 7d.; engravings, wrapper, 4d.; cloth, neat 1s. Way of the Cross, as practised at the Oratory. 2d. Child's Book for Lent, 2d. How to Spend Lent, 4d. Little Book for the Lovers of Jesus Crucified (Kenmare Series), 4d. Devotions for Quarant 'Ore. From the Italian. Edited by Cardinal WISEMAN. 1s. 6d. and 2s. Popular Devotions for Quarant 'Ore. 1d.

**St. Liguori.** Reflections on Spiritual Subjects and on the Passion of Our Lord. With Memoir and Frontispiece. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

**Of Adoration in Spirit and in Truth.** In Four Books. By J. E. NIEREMBERG, S.J. With a Preface by the Rev. Father GALLWEY, S.J. Price 6s.

**On the Love of Our Lord Jesus Christ.** By the Rev. F. NEPVEU. Cloth, 8d. An Hour before my Crucifix. Preface by Father GALLWEY, S.J. 4d. The Holy Hour. Second Edition. By Father WELD, S.J. Cloth, 6d.

**Cookery Manual for Days of Fasting and Abstinence.** 1s.

**Meditations for the Use of the Clergy, for Every Day in the Year,** on the Gospels for the Sundays. From the Italian of Mgr. SCOTTI, Archbishop of Thessalonica. Revised and Edited by the Oblates of St. Charles. With a Preface by his Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. Vol. 2. From Septuagesima Sunday to the Fourth Sunday after Easter. Price 4s.

**The Devotions of the Lady Lucy Herbert of Powis, formerly Prioress** of the Augustinian Nuns at Bruges. Price 3s. 6d.

**A Hundred Meditations on the Love of God.** By ROBERT SOUTHWELL, of the Society of Jesus, Priest and Martyr, with Portrait. Edited, with a Preface, by Father JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Price 6s. 6d. Calf, red edges, 12s. (An entirely original work, now first published.)

**A Treatise on the Particular Examen of Conscience,** according to the Method of St. IGNATIUS. By Father LUIS DE LA PALMA, of the Society of Jesus. Author of the "History of the Sacred Passion." With Preface by Father GEORGE PORTER, S.J. Price 2s. 6d.

**A Spiritual Compendium,** in which the Principal Difficulties in the way of Perfection are Explained. By Father GASPAR DE LA FIGUERA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish by Mrs. R. BENNETT. Edited by Rev. GEORGE PORTER, S.J. Price 4s. 6d.

**Meditations on the Life of Our Lord, for Every Day of the Year** and the Principal Feasts. By Father LANCICIUS, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Latin. [In the Press.]

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

# MUSIC FOR LENT,

## FOR VOCAL PERFORMANCE.

Casali's Mass of St. Felix, in A. 5s.  
Casali's Mass of St. Victor, in C. 5s.  
Casali's Mass of St. Bernard (a short Mass). 3s. 6d.  
Crookall's, John, D.D. (a short Mass). 3s. 6d.  
Palestrina's Mass, *Æterna Christi munera*. 3s. 6d.

**MISSA DE ANGELIS.** 2s. Voice part, 6d.

## MOTETTS FOR SUNDAYS IN LENT, FOR VOCAL PERFORMANCE.

1. *Scapulis suis*. 1s.—2. *Meditabor*. 1s.—3. *Justitiae Domini*. 1s.—4. *Laudate Dominum*. 1s.—5. *Confitebor tibi*. 1s.—6. *Palm Sunday: Improperium*. 1s.—*Maundy Thursday: Dextera Domini*. 1s.

**DEVOTIONS FOR LENT.** A short Popular Service of Psalms, Hymns and Prayers, suited for singing, &c. 2d. Music for the above, and other Services, 1s. 6d.

**THE POPULAR CHOIR MANUAL.** Containing the whole of the Holy Week Services, with Music, in such a way as to be easily sung by any choir. (This is the first time that a work so much needed has been supplied.) Also the "*Miserere*," the "*Adjuva nos*," &c. Music for all the other seasons follows in regular order. Price, Morning Service, 3s. 6d.; Evening, 5s. 6d.

**OFFICIUM HEBDOMADÆ SANCTÆ.** 32mo, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.; imitation calf, 4s. 6d.; calf, 5s.; morocco, 6s. 18mo, with music, 4s.; imitation calf, 6s. 6d. calf, 7s.; morocco, 8s.

**THE OFFICES OF HOLY WEEK,** printed in full in their proper order, with the Psalms pointed for chanting or reciting. 18mo, 1s.; roan, 1s. 6d.; gilt edges, 2s.; calf, 4s.; morocco, 4s. 6d.

\*.\* The only edition of the Holy Week Offices printed entire, without abbreviation or reference, and pointed for recitation or chanting, so as to prevent the possibility of mistake.

**CANTUS PASSIONIS.** Folio, cloth, 13s.—*Adjuva nos*. 1d.

**POPULÆ REUS.** The Reproaches for Good Friday, for Four Voices, with the "*Improperium expectavit*." 1s.

**ENGLISH HYMNS FOR LENT AND THE PASSION.** Words and music 6d.

**AVE REGINA.** By ROMBERG. 6d. An easy and attractive piece.

**THE HYMNS PANGE LINGUA AND VEXILLA REGIS,** with music for processions. 2d.

**HYMNS FOR EVENING SERVICES DURING LENT,** for the "*Stations*" (several forms), "*Seven Words on the Cross*," &c. Twenty various, to which easy and popular tunes are adapted; in "*Hymns for the Year*," with the music, 1 vol. 2s.

**ALFIERI.** *Cantus Gregorianus Passionis D. N. J. C. secundum Matthæum, Marcum Lucam, et Joannem.* 3 vols. folio, 21s.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

# MESSRS. BURNS AND OATES

HAVE ON HAND, READY FOR IMMEDIATE USE, THE FOLLOWING

## SETS OF STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

THE LOWEST PRICES FOR CASH.

30 by 25 inches, Hard Plaster Composition, price, uncoloured,		
£26; for	£22	10 0
Ditto Coloured, £45; for	39	10 0
<i>(These are quite exceptionally low priced, and cannot be sold again at the same reduced rate).</i>		
15½ by 12 Roman, painted in all colours, and most skilfully grouped	14	14 0
21½ by 18 Painted in Oil Colours on canvas, complete set	14	14 0
28½ by 23½ Painted in Oil Colours, and in black and gold frames, with crosses at top numbered	36	15 0
31 by 26 Plain Prints, mounted and varnished, with crosses complete	8	8 0
28½ by 23 Coloured Prints, mounted and varnished, with black backgrounds, &c.	8	8 0
26½ by 21 Coloured Prints, mounted and varnished on strainers	10	0 0
16 by 15 In Relief, plain, £15 15s.; or partly gilt	18	18 0
*8½ by 6 Mounted under glass, with crosses at top, numbered complete, plain prints	1	5 0
" Coloured, ditto	1	16 0
* These are suitable for private use, Oratory or Schoolrooms.		

### IN SHEETS.

30½ by 21 Set of Oleographs Printed in Oil Colours, in imitation of Painting	14	0 0
34 by 24 A Fine Set of Coloured Lithographs	6	17 6
<i>Also a large and varied stock of Sets of Stations, both large and small, of which a separate list may be had on application.</i>		
23½ by 15 The Crucifixion, Oil Painting on Canvas, in dark wood frame	3	3 0
21 by 17 Ditto. After A. DURER, on Canvas	4	0 0
26½ by 22½ Ditto Oleograph in ornamental gilt frame.	1	12 6
22½ by 14 Ecce Homo Oleograph, after Guido, on canvas and in gilt ornamental frame, with oval spandrel	1	18 0
Mater Dolorosa, pendant to ditto.	1	18 0

### CALVARY GROUP.

Beautifully modelled Crucifix, on large oak colour Cross, and side figures of the Mater Dolorosa and St. John; the whole beautifully coloured naturally, and suitable for a large Church.	£15	15 0
Carved wood Crucifix, 2 feet on 4 feet 3 Oak Cross.	4	4 0
Do. do. 21 in. on 4 feet 2 polished, Black Cross.	7	10 0
Do. do. 25 inches coloured on 6 feet Black Cross.	11	11 0
Do. do. coloured 3 feet 2 on Cross 7 feet.	4	15 0
Do. do. (dark wood on Black Cross) 2 feet 2 on Cross 4½ feet	9	0 0
Do. do. 15 inches on 3 feet 9 Oak Cross.	3	13 6

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

## NEW AND STANDARD WORKS.

**Cæsarism and Ultramontanism.**—A Paper read before the "Academy of the Catholic Religion." By his Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. With a Preface. Price 1s.

**Catholic Sheet Almanac**, compiled by the Editor of the Catholic Directory; with the approbation of the Archbishop and Bishops of England. Printed in red and black. Price 2d.; by post, 2½d.; 6 copies post free, 1s.

**A Nun's Advice to her Girls.** By Sister M. F. CLARE of Kenmare. Cloth extra, 2s. 6d.

This is an English adaptation of a work recently published in America, where it had a circulation of 15 to 20,000 copies in one year.

**Count de Montalembert's Letters to a Schoolfellow.** 1827—1830. Qualis ab incepto. Translated from the French by C. F. AUDLEY. With portrait. 5s.

**Ecclesiastical Antiquities of London and its Suburbs.** By ALEXANDER WOOD, M.A., Oxon, of the Somerset Archaeological Society. 5s.

O, who the ruins sees, whom wonder doth not fill  
With our great fathers' pompe, devotion and their skill.

**Cherubini: Memorials illustrative of his Life.** With Portrait, and Catalogue of his works. By EDWARD BELLASIS, Barrister-at-Law.

[Nearly ready.]

**The Pilgrimage Hymn.** Adapted for use in Churches. Sung at Paray-le-Monial. Price 6d. per dozen; or twenty-five for 1s.

### CATHOLIC TRUTH TRACTS.

*New issues.*

**Manchester Dialogues.** First Series. By Rev. Fr. HARPER, S.J.

No. I. The Pilgrimage.

II. Are Miracles going on still?

III. Popish Miracles tested by the Bible.

IV. Popish Miracles.

Price of each, 3s. per 100.

**True to Trust; or, the Story of a Portrait.** A Tale of the Times of Queen Elizabeth. Price 4s.

A powerful and more than ordinarily well-written story of Catholic life at that eventful period so full of interest to Catholics. Several of the characters are admirably drawn. We are sure that it will prove a favourite amongst our young people.—*Weekly Register*.

The volume will be a welcome addition to the Catholic stories of days long gone by. The style is lucid, the plot very fairly shown, and the characters are natural. There is a religious and social tone about the book which makes it most acceptable. We are sure that amongst the young it will be a favourite.—*Catholic Times*.

**The Pope and the German Emperor.** Letter to his Majesty King William of Prussia, Emperor of Germany. By ATHANASIUS CLEMENT. Price 1s. 6d. per dozen.

**The Consolations of the Just Man at the Hour of Death.** By Father LOUIS FERRARA, S.J. Translated from the Italian. 6d.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.



## NEW AND STANDARD WORKS.

**The Life of St. John of the Cross, of the Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.** Price 3s. 6d.

Sol in aspectu, annuncians in exitu, vas admirabile opus Excelsi.

**Marie and Paul. A Fragment.** By "Our Little Woman." Price 3s. 6d.; gilt edges, 4s.

We heartily recommend this little book, especially as a present for children and for schools, feeling sure that none can rise from its perusal without being touched, both at the beauty of the tale itself and by the tone of earnest piety which runs through the whole, leaving none but holy thoughts and pleasant impressions on the minds of both young and old.—*Tablet*.

Well adapted to the innocent minds it is intended for. The little book would be a suitable present for a little friend.—*Catholic Opinion*.

A charming tale for young and old.—*Cork Examiner*.

In "Marie and Paul," which its authoress modestly styles "a fragment," we can recognize the style of a lady who knows well how to tell a story effectively and touchingly. The scene is laid in a French village; and the death of a loved relative on the battle-field is told with all that tenderness and pathos in which gifted women so much excel. When the authoress next appears in print we hope to see something better than a mere "fragment" at her hands.—*Weekly Register*.

**Seven Stories.** By LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON. Contents:—

1. Rosemary: A Tale of the Fire of London.
2. Reparation: A Story of the Reign of Louis XIV.
3. The Blacksmith of Antwerp.
4. The Beggar of the Steps of St. Roch: A True Story.
5. Trouvaille; or, the Soldier's adopted Child.
6. Earth without Heaven: a Reminiscence.
7. Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam. Price 3s. 6d.

Will well repay perusal. The authoress has at once such a grasp of her subject, and of Catholic principles in action; there is such a force and finish in her touch, and she so admirably portrays the incidents of every-day life, that the productions of her pen will stand the test of the most rigid criticism.—*Weekly Register*.

Each story in this series has its own charm. The title of the last might serve as a motto for the whole, for they all tend "ad majorem Dei gloriam."—*Tablet*.

It is needless to refer to the many benefits this well-known author has conferred on our literature; and in this collection may be found stories sound in doctrine, and intensely interesting, as any which have come from the same pen.—*Catholic Opinion*.

As admirable for their art as they are estimable for their sound teaching.—*Cork Examiner*.

**The Life of the Venerable Anna Maria Taigi, the Roman Matron (1769—1837).** Being Vol. V. of the "Library of Religious Biography."

Edited by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. With Portrait, 9s.

This Biography has been written after a careful collation of previous Lives of the Servant of God with each other, and with the "Analecta Juris Pontificii," which contain large extracts from the Processes. Various prophecies attributed to her and holy persons have been collected in an appendix.

Of all the series of deeply-interesting biographies which the untiring zeal and piety of Mr. Healy Thompson has given of late years to English Catholics, none, we think, is to be compared in interest with the one before us, both from the absorbing nature of the life itself and the spiritual lessons it conveys.—*Tablet*.

A complete biography of the Venerable Matron, in the composition of which the greatest care has been taken and the best authorities consulted. We can safely recommend the volume for the discrimination with which it has been written and for the careful labour and completeness by which it has been distinguished.—*Catholic Opinion*.

We recommend this excellent and carefully-compiled biography to all our readers. The evident care exercised by the editor in collating the various lives of Anna Maria gives great value to the volume, and we hope it will meet with the support it so justly merits.—*Westminster Gazette*.

We thank Mr. Healy Thompson for this volume. The direct purpose of his biographies is always spiritual edification.—*Dublin Review*.

Contains much that is capable of nourishing pious sentiments.—*Nation*.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

# NEW AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS

LATELY IMPORTED BY BURNS AND OATES.

**The Life of St. Alphonsus Liguori,**  
Founder of the Congregation of the Most  
Holy Redeemer. By a Member of the  
Order of Mercy. With Portrait. 1 vol.  
8vo, 689 pp., price 10s.

**Father Burke's Sermons and  
Lectures.** First and second series. Each  
12s.

**The Ferryman of the Tiber.** An  
Historical Tale from the Italian. 6s.

**Christ and the Church: Lectures**  
by the Rev. THOMAS PRESTON, New York. 6s.

**The Flemings; or, Truth Tri-  
umphant.** A Tale by Mrs. DORSEY. Cloth  
7s. 6d.

**The Byrnes of Glengoulah.** A true  
Tale by ALICE NOLAN. 6s.

**Elia; or, Spain Fifty Years Ago.**  
By GATALLERO. Cloth, 5s. 6d.

**The Happiness of Heaven.** By a  
Father of the Society of Jesus. Neat cloth, 4s.

**The Truce of God: a Tale of the  
Eleventh Century.** By GEO. H. MILES. One  
vol. cloth, 4s.

**Mount Benedict; or, the Violated  
Tomb.** A Tale of the Charlestown Convent.  
By PETER MCCORRY. One vol. cloth, 4s.

**The Heart of Myrrha Lake; or,  
Into the Light of Catholicity.** By MINNIE  
MARY LEE. Price 4s. 6d.

**The Life and Times of Sixtus the  
Fifth.** By BAREN HUBNER. Translated from  
the original French by James F. MELINE.  
Price 4s. 6d.

**Meditations on the Most Blessed  
Virgin Mary.** By Brother PHILIPPE, Super-  
ior-General of the Brothers of the Christian  
Schools. Translated from the French. 8s.

**A Winged Word: and other  
Sketches and Stories.** By M. A. T. Price 6s.

**The Money God; or, the Empire  
and the Papacy.** A Tale of the Third Cen-  
tury. By M. A. QUINTON, author of "Aurelia."  
Cloth, 6s.

**The Progressionists and Angela.**  
Translated from the German of CONRAD VON  
BOLANDER. Price 6s.

**The Brothers of the Christian  
Schools,** during the war of 1870-71. From  
the French of J. D'ARSAZ. With thirty-two  
Illustrations. Large 8vo, price 16s.

**Hawthornean; or, Philip Ben-  
ten's Family.** A Story of Every-day Life.  
By Mrs. CLARA M. THOMPSON. Cloth, 6s. 6d.

**Tales.** By HENDRIK CONSCIENCE.  
Translated expressly for this edition.

1. The Amulet. Price 4s.

2. The Fisherman's Daughter. Price 4s.

**The Manual of Controversy: con-  
taining Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine;  
Fifty Reasons why the Roman Catholic Re-  
ligion ought to be preferred to all others**  
Cloth, 3s. 6d.

**The Nesbits; or, a Mother's Last  
Request; and other Tales.** By Uncle PAUL.  
Price 4s.

**Only a Pin! An instructive moral  
Story.** Translated from the French of J. T.  
DE SAINT GERMAINE. By P. S. Price 4s.

**A Compendium of the History of  
the Catholic Church,** from the commencement  
of the Christian Era to the Ecumenical  
Council of the Vatican. Compiled and trans-  
lated from the best authors by Rev. THEODORE  
NORTON. Price 8s.

**The Life of the Most Rev. M. J.  
Spalding, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore.** By  
J. L. SPALDING, S.T.L. With portrait. One  
vol. 8vo. 460 pp. 10s.

**Irish Emigration to the United  
States:** What it has been and what it is.  
Facts and reflections especially addressed to  
Irish people intending to emigrate from their  
native land, and to those living in the large  
cities of Great Britain and of the United  
States. By the Rev. STEPHEN BYRNE, O.S.D.  
With map. One vol. 12mo, 5s. 6d.

Contains just the knowledge which should be  
most highly prized by the settler.—*Catholic World.*

**Good Things for Catholic Readers:**  
a Miscellany of Catholic Biography, History,  
Travels, &c. Containing pictures and sketches  
of eminent persons representing the Church  
and Cloister, the state and home, remarkable  
places connected with religion, famous events  
in all lands and times, &c. With 108 illus-  
trations. One vol. fcap. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W. AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

BURNS AND OATES,  
LIST OF  
BREVIARIES, MISSALS,  
HORÆ DIURNÆ AND OTHER LITURGICAL WORKS.

*N.B.—This List annuls all preceding.*

- Breviarium Romanum.** Mechlin, 4 vols. 4to, red and black, 2*l.* 8*s.*; calf, 5*l.* 10*s.*; morocco, 7*l.* 7*s.* India paper, 2*l.* 18*s.*; calf, 6*l.*; morocco, 7*l.* 17*s.*
- Ratisbon edition, No. I. 4 vols. 4to, red and black, 2*l.* 10*s.*; calf, 5*l.* 15*s.*; morocco, 7*l.* 10*s.* No. II. 4 vols. 4to, 3*l.* 10*s.* No. III. 4 vols. 4to, 6*l.* No. IV. 4 vols. 8*l.*
- 4 vols. 8vo, red and black, fine paper, 1*l.* 18*s.*; calf, 3*l.* 18*s.*; morocco, 4*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* India paper, 2*l.* 2*s.*; calf, 4*l.* 2*s.*; morocco, 4*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*
- 4 vols. 12mo, red and black, fine paper, 1*l.* 1*s.*; calf, 2*l.* 4*s.*; morocco, 2*l.* 15*s.* India paper, 1*l.* 6*s.*; calf, 2*l.* 8*s.*; morocco, 3*l.*
- With Franciscan supplement, fine paper, 1*l.* 8*s.*; calf, 2*l.* 15*s.*; morocco, 3*l.* 6*s.*
- Mechlin, 4 vols. 18mo, red and black, fine paper, 1*l.*; imitation calf, 1*l.* 8*s.* net; calf, 1*l.* 18*s.*; morocco, 2*l.* 6*s.* India paper, 1*l.* 2*s.*; calf, 2*l.*; morocco, 2*l.* 8*s.*
- Ratisbon edition, 4 vols. 18mo, red and black, 1*l.* for 15*s.*; in calf, 1*l.* 15*s.* net; morocco, 2*l.*
- Mechlin, 4 vols. 24mo, red and black, fine paper, 1*l.*; calf, 1*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 2*l.* 4*s.* India paper, 1*l.* 1*s.*; calf, 2*l.*; morocco, 2*l.* 7*s.*
- Mechlin, 4 vols. 32mo, red and black, fine paper, 17*s.*; imitation calf, 1*l.* 2*s.* net; calf, 1*l.* 11*s.*; morocco, 1*l.* 18*s.* India paper, 19*s.*; calf, 1*l.* 13*s.* morocco, 2*l.*
- Breviarium Romanum totum.** Mechlin, 18mo, 11*s.*; calf, 17*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 19*s.*
- Breviarium Romanum totum.** 18mo, Ratisbon edition, very good for travelling, price unbound, 16*s.*
- Breviarium S. Ord. Præd.** 2 vols. 12mo, 17*s.*; calf, 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*
- Breviarium Monasticum.** 4 vols. 18mo, 1*l.* 10*s.*; calf, 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*
- Canon Missæ.** Ratisbon, printed separately from large folio Missal, price 3*s.*
- Cantus Passionis D.N.J.C.** Ratisbon, folio, 3*s.*
- Cæleste Palmetum.** 3*s.*; calf, 7*s.*; morocco, 8*s.* 6*d.* With plates, 4*s.* 6*d.*; calf, 8*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 10*s.*
- Epistolæ et Evangelia.** Ratisbon, in folio, No. I. 1*l.* No. II. 3*l.* net. No. III. 7*l.* net. No. IV. 18*l.* net.
- Epistolæ et Evangelia.** Mechlin, folio, 1*l.* 3*s.*; calf, men. 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*; morocco monogram, 3*l.* 3*s.*
- Horæ Diurnæ.** Ratisbon, 18mo, 3*s.*; calf, 7*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 9*s.* Mechlin, 18mo, 4*s.* 6*d.*; calf, 8*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 10*s.* 6*d.*
- Horæ Diurnæ.** 32mo, Ratisbon, 2*s.* 6*d.*; calf, 5*s.*; morocco, 6*s.* Mechlin, 32mo, 3*s.*; calf, 5*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 6*s.* 6*d.* 48mo, Mechlin, 2*s.* 6*d.*; calf, 5*s.*; morocco, 6*s.*
- Horæ Diurnæ Franciscanerum.** 8vo, 8*s.* 6*d.*; calf, 17*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 1*l.* 4*s.* 18mo, 5*s.* 6*d.* 32mo, 3*s.* 6*d.*; calf, 6*s.* 6*d.*; morocco, 7*s.*

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.



# BREVIARIES, MISSALS, ETC.

(Continued.)

- Horæ Diurnæ Sac. Ord. Præd.** 32mo, 3s. 6d.; calf, 6s. 6d.; morocco, 7s.
- Graduale Romanum.** Ratisbon, 1871. Folio, red and black, price, 2 vols. No. I. 5l. 10s. No. II. 6l. 10s. No. III. 8l. 10s.
- Mechlin, folio, 1l. 10s.; half calf, 2l. 2s.
- Ratisbon, 8vo (1871), 7s. 6d.
- Mechlin, 8vo, 6s.; half calf, 9s.
- Missale Romanum.** Mechlin, large folio, vellum paper, 2l.; calf, 3l. 12s. 6d.; morocco, gilt monograms, 4l. 10s.; red morocco, elegant, 6l., and upwards. Ratisbon, *in the press*.
- Folio (Tours edition), 2l. 13s. 6d.; red morocco, elegant, from 7l. upwards.
- Folio (Vienna), with beautiful Gothic type and illustrations, morocco, 8l. 8s.
- Folio (Ratisbon), with illustrated border and woodcuts, unbound, 1l. 15s. and upwards; calf, gilt mon. 3l.; morocco, gilt mon., 3l. 10s.; 5l. 5s.; 7l. 7s.; 10l. 10s., &c. &c.
- Folio (Salviucci), unbound, 1l. 10s.; red morocco, elegant, 6l. 10s.
- Small folio, 1l. 5s.; calf, 2l. 10s.; calf, gilt mon. 2l. 15s.; morocco, 3l. 3s.; morocco, gilt mon., 4l.; red morocco, elegant, 5l. 10s.
- Missale Romanum.** Mechlin, 4to, 1l. 3s. 6d.; calf plain, 2l. 7s. 6d.; calf, gilt mon. 2l. 12s. 6d.; morocco, plain, 2l. 12s.; morocco, gilt mon. 2l. 17s.; morocco, elegant, 5l. 10s.
- Ratisbon, unbound, from 1l. to 9l. 9s.; bound, from 2l. 10s. to 15l. 15s.
- Small 4to (Mechlin), 17s. 6d.; calf, plain, 1l. 14s. 6d.; calf, gilt mon. 2l.; morocco plain, 2l. 2s. 6d.; morocco gilt mon., 2l. 7s. 6d.; red morocco elegant, 3l. 3s. and upwards.
- Ratisbon unbound, from 10s. to 1l. 10s.; bound, from 1l. to 3l. 3s.
- 8vo (Mechlin), white paper, 8s.; India, 10s. 6d.; bound, from 15s. This new missal is very serviceable for small Chapels and Oratories.
- 12mo, fine paper, unbound, 6s.; calf, 12s.; morocco, 14s. 6d.; morocco gilt, 19s.
- India paper, unbound, 7s. 6d.; calf, 13s. 6d.; morocco, 16s.; morocco gilt, 1l. 1s.
- Missale Monasticum.** Folio (Roman edition), morocco, 3l. 15s.; gilt mon. 4l. 4s.
- Small folio (Ratisbon), 1l. 3s.; also better edition, 2l.; in calf, 2l. 7s. 6d.; red morocco, 5l. 10s. &c.
- Small 4to (Mechlin), unbound, 1l. 3s.; calf plain, 2l. 2s.; gilt mon. 2l. 7s. morocco plain, 2l. 7s. 6d.; gilt mon., 2l. 12s. 6d.
- Missale Sacri Ordinis Prædicatorum.** Large 8vo, unbound, 16s.; calf, 1l. 7s.; morocco, 1l. 11s. 6d.
- Missale Rom. Carm. Discalc.** Small folio, 1l. 6s.; and better edition, 2l.
- Missæ pro Defunctis.** Mechlin, folio, morocco, 14s.; large 8vo, leather, 4s.
- Ratisbon, in folio, from 2s. 6d. to 1l. 5s.; calf, 15s.; morocco, 1l.
- Officium Hebdomadæ Sanctæ.** Ratisbon, 4to, 3s.
- Mechlin, 18mo, with music, 4s.; calf, 7s.; morocco, 8s.
- 32mo, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.; calf, 5s.; morocco, 6s.
- Vesperale Romanum.** Ratisbon, folio, *in the press*.
- 8vo, shortly to be published.
- Folio (Mechlin), 1l. 10s.; half calf, 2l. 2s.
- 8vo (Mechlin), 7s. 6d.; half calf, 10s. 6d.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

## QUARTERLY SERIES.

(CONDUCTED by the MANAGERS of the "MONTH.")

1. **The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.** By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Vol. I. Price 7s. 6d. [Reprinting.]
2. **The Life of St. Jane Frances Fremyot de Chantal.** By EMILY BOWLES. A new edition shortly. Price 5s. 6d.
3. **The History of the Sacred Passion.** By Father LUIS DE LA PALMA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Second edition. Price 7s. 6d.
4. **The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.** By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Vol. 2. Price 10s. 6d.
5. **Ierne of Armorica: A Tale of the Time of Chlovis.** By J. C. BATEMAN. Price 6s. 6d.
6. **The Life of Dona Luisa de Carvajal.** By Lady GEORGIANA FULLERTON. Price 6s.
7. **The Life of the Blessed John Berchmans.** By the Rev. F. GOLDIE. Price 6s.
8. **The Life of the Blessed Peter Favre,** of the Society of Jesus; First Companion of St. Ignatius Loyola. From the Italian of Father GUISEPPE BOERO, of the same Society. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Price 6s.

[This Life has been written on the occasion of the beatification of the Ven. Peter Favre, and contains the *Memoriale* or record of his private thoughts and meditations, written by himself.]

### IN PREPARATION:—

**The Dialogues of St. Gregory.** Old English version modernized. [In March, 1874.]

**The Life of Sister Anne Catharine Emmerich,** with a Prefatory Essay on her Contemplations on Our Lord's Life and Passion.

**The Dauphin and his Companions in the Temple.** By M. O'C. MORRIS.

**The Life of Lady Falkland,** Mother of the great Lord Falkland. By Lady GEORGIANA FULLERTON.

**The Life of our Life.** By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE.

[The first volume will appear in the course of 1874.]

**The Life of St. Stanislaus Kostka.** By Father BOERO.

**The Life and Letters of St. Teresa.**

**The Life of Pius the Seventh.**

**St. Jerome and his Correspondents.**

**The Confessions of St. Augustine.** Old translation modernized.

**The Life of Blessed Mary of the Incarnation** (Madame ACARIE). By E. BOWLES.

**The Life of Cardinal Bellarmine.** By Rev. Father GOLDIE.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

# ST. JOSEPH'S ASCETICAL LIBRARY.

*Under the Editorship of Fathers of the Society of Jesus.*

---

- I. OF ADORATION IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH.** In Four Books. By J. E. NIEREMBERG, S.J. With Preface by the Father GALLWEY, S.J. Price 6s.
- II. A REMEMBRANCE FOR THE LIVING TO PRAY FOR THE DEAD.** By Father JAMES MUMFORD, S.J. Reprinted from the Author's Improved Edition. Published in Paris, 1661; with an Appendix on the Heroic Act, by Father JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Second Edition. Price 2s.
- III. THE VIRTUES OF BLESSED MARY, MOTHER OF JESUS CHRIST.** By Father FRANCIS ARIAS, of the Society of Jesus. With Preface by Father GEORGE PORTER, S.J. Cloth extra, 2s. 6d.
- IV. A GUIDE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SPIRITUAL UNION.** Established by the Venerable Domenico Gesu e Maria, General of the Discalced Carmelites. **The Last Testament of the Soul.** By St. CHARLES BORROMEO, Cardinal Archbishop of Milan. **Spiritual Contract of the Soul with the Lord our God.** By Father ALVARO ARIAS, S.J. Translated from the Italian. One Vol. 1s. 6d.
- V. THE DEVOTIONS OF THE LADY LUCY HERBERT OF POWIS,** formerly Prioress of the Augustinian Nuns at Bruges. Edited by Rev. JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Price 3s. 6d.
- VI. A HUNDRED MEDITATIONS ON THE LOVE OF GOD.** By ROBERT SOUTHWELL, of the Society of Jesus, Priest and Martyr. An entirely original work now first published. With portrait. Edited, with a preface by Father JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Price 6s. 6d.
- VII. A TREATISE ON THE PARTICULAR EXAMEN OF CONSCIENCE,** according to the Method of St. Ignatius. By Father LUIS DE LA PALMA, of the Society of Jesus. Author of the "History of the Sacred Passion." With Preface by Father GEORGE PORTER, S.J. Price 2s. 6d.
- VIII. A SPIRITUAL COMPENDIUM,** in which the Principal Difficulties in the Way of Perfection are explained. By Father GASPAR DE LA FIGUERA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish by Mrs. R. BENNETT. Edited by Rev. GEORGE PORTER, S.J. Foolscap 8vo, price 4s. 6d.
- This valuable and standard work, published originally at Valladolid in 1635, has run through more than sixteen editions in Spanish. The present translation is from that of 1857, printed at Barcelona. Translations have likewise appeared at various times in Latin, Italian, and German.
- IX. MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD,** for every Day of the Year, and the principal Feasts. By Fr. LANCICIUS, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Latin. [Nearly ready.]
- 

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

# THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

NEW SERIES.—JANUARY, 1874.

No. XLIII.—PRICE SIX SHILLINGS.

---

## CONTENTS.

I. Mr. Mill's Phenomenism.—II. Taine's History of English Literature.—III. Esory and the Canon Law.—IV. Jarvis's History of the Church of France.—V. The Archbishop of Westminster on Devotion to the Sacred Heart.—VI. The Religious Education of Women.—VII. Catholic Higher Studies in England.—VIII. The Situation in France.—IX. Catholic Church Architecture.

---

## THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE OF THE HOLY ROSARY,

(LATE "THE ROSARIAN").

NEW SERIES.—PRICE ONE PENNY.

---

CONTENTS OF No. 18.—JANUARY, 1874.

Sacrum Septenarium. No. V.—"The Flight into Egypt" (Poetry).—The Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque (By Rev. C. B. Garside).—Louise Latéau, of Bois d'Haine.—Belgian Pilgrimage to Montaign.—Anecdote of the Rosary.—Record of Current Events.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

---

## THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL,

*Conducted by a Society of Clergymen under Episcopal Sanction.*

---

CONTENTS OF No. CX.—VOL. X. DECEMBER, 1873.

The Irish Massacre of 1641.—The Church and Modern Thought.—Harmony of the Passion. V. Dissertation. 2. On the Order of Events at the Last Supper.—Documents. I. Encyclical of His Holiness Pope Pius IX. II. Beatification and Canonization of the Ven. Joannis Baptistæ De-la-Salle.

IMPRIMATUR, \* PAULUS CARDINALIS CULLEN, *Archiepiscopus Dublinensis.*

DUBLIN: W. B. KELLY, 8, GRAFTON STREET. LONDON: BURNS & OATES.  
NEW YORK, UNITED STATES: P. M. HAVERTY, 1, BARCLAY STREET.

*Terms for Great Britain, per Annum, Six Shillings; by Post, Seven Shillings—*

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

# THE MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART.

THIRD SERIES.—JANUARY, 1874.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

---

## CONTENTS:—

Intention for January.—The Spirit of Praise according to the Heart of Jesus.—Poetry: Jesus Nazareus transibat. St. Peter's Midnight Mass.—Devotion to the Sacred Heart, and Modern Thought.—The Heart of Jesus consoled by the Communion of Reparation.—You are the Sons of the Saints.—St. Winefride, Virgin, Martyr, Abbess, Patroness of Wales.—Rash Judgment rebutted in a King in the Sixth Century.—Interests of the Heart of Jesus.—Home Record.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

---

## CATHOLIC IRELAND.

A MONTHLY MEMORIAL OF OUR COUNTRY'S CONSECRATION TO THE HEART OF JESUS.

Edited by the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J., Limerick.

---

### CONTENTS OF NO. 7.—JANUARY, 1874.

A Happy New Year.—A Pearl in Dark Waters. Chapter II.—To the Mother of the Christmas Babe.—Sketch of the late Father Henry Young. By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Chapters V. and VI.—In Memory of the late Earl of Dunraven.—Jack Hazlitt. Chapters XII. and XIII.—The Relations of the Church to Society. Part II. By Rev. E. J. O'Reilly, S.J.—Jottings from a Greek Prayer-book. IV. Confession.—Christmas Memories.—Mary of Inisard. The Story of a Snowy Christmas-Eve.—A few Christmas Books.

---

DUBLIN: MCGLASHAN & GILL, 50, Upper Sackville Street. LONDON: BURNS & OATES, 17, Portman Street.

HALF-YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, INCLUDING POSTAGE, 3s. (*Paid in Advance.*)

---

## CATHOLIC PROGRESS.

The Journal of the Young Men's Catholic Association.

CONDUCTED BY THE MEMBERS. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

---

### CONTENTS OF NO. 25.—JANUARY, 1874.—PRICE THREEPENCE.

A Political Bugbear.—Professor Huxley's Philosophy.—Faith and Reason.—Margaret Chapel.—Metaphysics for the Million. VII. Substance.—An Old London Sport.—Sir Everard de Crowle: A Tale of the Thirteenth Century.—Daily Worries.—Sonnet. XVII. A Roseleaf.

---

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.



## NEW STANDARD LESSON BOOKS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

ADAPTED TO THE REVISED CODE OF 1871.

	d.	Per doz.		Per doz.
Children's Primer .....in cloth	4	3 0	Book V. for Standards V.	
Part I. ....	2½	1 11	and VI. ....in cloth,	1s. 4d. .. 13 0
Part II. ....	3½	2 8	ALSO,	
Book I. for Standard I....	6	4 6	Primer (Part I.), stitched	
" II. ....	7	5 3	wrapper.....	0 1½ .. 1 2
" III. ....	10	7 6	Lesson Sheets, large type,	
" IV. ....	1½	9 0	per set, 1 6 ..	1 2

## SERIES OF READING BOOKS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

	s. d.		s. d.
Primer.....per dozen	1 4	Fourth Book.....per dozen	12 6
First Book.....	2 0	*.* The new books marked * supply the want of	
*Supplement to ditto.....	4 0	additional reading which is often felt in the	
Second Book.....	5 0	junior classes. They also comprise elemen-	
*Supplement to ditto.....	6 0	tary lessons in writing and arithmetic.	
Third Book.....	8 0	Tablet Lessons, in sheets, very large type.	
		Price per set	1 6

## Series of RELIGIOUS READING BOOKS by a DIOCESAN INSPECTOR.

No. 1, SUITABLE TO STANDARDS 1 & 2.

Price 10d., with full Allowance to Schools.

No. 2, FOR STANDARDS 2 & 3, now ready, 1s.

No. 3, " " 4 & 5, 1s. 6d.

*The New Testament Narrative*, in the words of the Sacred Writers. With Notes, Chronological Tables and Maps. Price 2s.

*Poetry*.—First Book, with Illustrations. 1s.

Second Book (Popular Poetry). 2s.

Third Book (with Notices by De Vere). 3s. 6d.

*History*.—A Historical Catechism for the use of schools, from the earliest ages to the present time; with appropriate Verses, to be learnt by heart. By the Author of the "Introduction to English History. 4d.

A Coloured Chart, to accompany the same, representing the different events in such a way as to fix them readily on the pupil's memory. 2s. 6d.; or on rollers, 5s. 6d.

\*.\* The above, used together, will be found to teach history and chronology effectually in a very short time.

Ancient History, by Bridges. 3s.

Modern " 4s.

Popular Ancient History, including Greece. 1s. 4d.

History of England for Colleges, &c. 6s.

" " Introduction to, with Questions. 1s. 8d.

" " for the Young (plates). 3s.

" " Catechism of. 6d.

History of France, Outlines of, by Ince, 1s. cloth, 1s. 6d.

*Music*.—Sight-Singing Made Easy. Part I. contains the elements of singing, on an improved and simple plan, combining the advantages of the Tonic Sol-fa system with the ordinary notation; suited for schools and convents. 6d.

Sight-Singing Made Easy. Part II. containing further exercises, and easy Part Songs, Catches, &c., with an easy Introduction to Harmony, answering also the purpose of a School Song-Book. 6d.

Hymns and Melodies (244), beginning with the simplest tunes and going on to the more advanced, suited to the "Oratory Hymns," the "Hymns for the Year," the "Holy Family Hymns," and every other Hymn-Book. 1s.

*Religious Knowledge*.—Catechism in nineteen sheets, large type. 4s.

Manual of Confirmation, containing the Office of Confirmation, Catechism and Considerations. 2d.

Manual of Instruction in Christian Doctrine, for Pupil Teachers, Schools, &c. New Edition. 3s.

Catechism of Confirmation, by Richards. 1d.

Fleury's Historical Catechism (Formby). Per dozen, 2s.

Catechism of the Catholic Religion, by Deharbe and Fander. Cloth, 2s.

Gospel Stories for the Young. 1s.

Scripture History, by Beeve and Challoner. 2s.

Prints for ditto (forty), coloured, 12s. and 16s.

Catechism of Christian Doctrine. 1d.

" " in French. 2d.

" " Confession. 2d.

*Compendious French Grammar*. Cloth, 1s.

\*.\* The above comprises the essentials of French grammar, with a complete view of the genders and pronouns, and is a useful remembrancer for those who have already studied grammar.

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W., AND PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

## NEW WORKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

**SERMONS, LECTURES, &c.**, by the late Rev. Father BUCKLEY, of Cork; edited, with a Memoir, by the Rev. CHARLES DAVIS, Adm. Skibbereen. Crown 8vo, handsome cloth, with Portrait, 6s.

**THE IRISH MONTHLY** (Catholic Ireland). Vol. I, with Contributions by Lady Georgiana Fullerton, Denis F. MacCarthy, Aubrey de Vere, the Author of "Ailey Moore," the Author of "Tyborne," &c., &c., 8vo, handsome cloth, 4s. 6d.

**THE BEST CATHOLIC PRAYER BOOKS**, new editions, in great variety of bindings, and at various prices (list free on application).

**THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.** Completely new and beautiful red-line edition, with frontispiece engraved specially for it. 18mo, handsome cloth, new design, 3s. 6d.; best morocco, 8s.; best calf, 7s. 6d.

**THE ARTIST OF COLLINGWOOD: an Irish Story.** By Baron NA CARRIAS. Cheaper edition, crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

**FESTIVAL TALES.** By J. F. WALLER. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s.

**THE SPOKEN WORD; or, the Art of Extemporary Preaching; its Utility, its Danger and its True Idea.** By the late Rev. T. J. POTTER, Professor of Sacred Eloquence in All Hallows College. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s.

By the same author:—

**THE PASTOR AND HIS PEOPLE.** 6s. **SACRED ELOQUENCE.** 6s.

**RUPERT AUBREY: a Tale.** 3s. **SIR HUMPHREY'S TRIAL: a Tale.** 2s. 6d.

**THE FARLEYES OF FARLEYE: a Tale.** 2s.

\*McGLASHAN and GILL have much pleasure in announcing that they have purchased the Stock and Copyrights of several of the Works of this well-known and deeply-lamented Catholic writer. The above can now be had from them, or through any bookseller; those out of print will shortly be reprinted.

**BALLADS, POPULAR POETRY and HOUSEHOLD SONGS of IRELAND.** Collected and arranged by DUNCATHAIL. New edition, 18mo, cloth, 1s.; paper cover, 6d.

**NOTES OF THE WANDERING JEW ON THE JESUITS AND THEIR OPPONENTS.** Edited by JOHN FAIRPLAY, Esq. 18mo, cloth, 1s. 6d.

**HISTORICAL AND LEGENDARY RECOLLECTIONS OF THE ROCK OF CASHEL.** By M. ST. JOHN NEVILLE. New and enlarged edition, 18mo, 1s.

**THE CONSOLING THOUGHTS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES**, gathered from his Writings, and arranged in order by the Rev. Père HUGUET. Translated from the Seventh French Edition. 12mo, cloth, 2s.; French morocco, 3s. 6d.

**LIFE OF THE VENERABLE MARY CHRISTINA**, of Savoy, Queen of the Two Sicilies. From the Italian. 18mo, stiff cover, 6d.

**MEMOIR OF PIUS IX.**, with beautiful coloured Portrait on Cover. Royal 32mo, cloth, 6d.; extra gilt and gilt edges, 1s.

**THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.** New edition, with Reflections translated for it at the ends of the Chapters. Royal 32mo, cloth, 1s.; morocco, 3s. 6d.; Persian calf, 3s. French morocco, 2s. 6d.

**DISCOVERY OF THE TOMB OF OLLAMH FODHLA** (Ollav Fola), Ireland's Famous Monarch and Law-giver, upwards of three thousand years ago, by EUGENE ALFRED CONWELL, M.R.F.A., &c.; with 56 Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, 5s.

**THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF IRISH NAMES OF PLACES.** By P. W. JOYCE, L.L.D., M.R.S.A. Third Edition, square 12mo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

By the same Author:—

**IRISH LOCAL NAMES EXPLAINED.** 2s.

**HOW TO PREPARE FOR CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION** under the new regulations. Second edition, enlarged, 3s. 6d.

**DARRE'S ELEMENTS OF PLANE AND SOLID GEOMETRY.** Revised and improved by the Rev. F. LENNON, Professor of Mathematics, &c., in Maynooth College. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

**THE PRACTICAL ENGLISH GRAMMAR**; comprising also an Analysis of Sentences, Composition, &c. Founded on the works of French, Latham, Craik, Morell, Hasliht, Murray, Lennie, Reid, &c. By ROSCON MORGAN, B.A. 12mo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

DUBLIN: McGLASHAN AND GILL, 50, UPPER SACKVILLE STREET.

**JOHN HARDMAN AND COMPANY,**  
**BIRMINGHAM,**  
*Medieval Metal Workers in Silver, Brass and Wrought Iron,*  
**MAKERS OF MEMORIAL BRASSES AND COFFIN FURNITURE,**  
**ARTISTS IN STAINED GLASS,**  
*Ecclesiastical Decorators, Carvers in Wood and Stone,*  
**MEDALLISTS AND LITHOGRAPHERS.**

**JOHN HARDMAN AND Co.** beg to draw attention to the **WROUGHT IRON CHANCEL SCREENS** they have erected in the Churches at Stone, Rugeley and Rugby, which, while separating the Sanctuary from the Body of the Church, do not impede the view of the Altar; to the **ROODS IN CARVED WOOD**, either suspended from the Chancel Arch, as at St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool, and Great Harwood, Lancashire, or supported by the Screen, as at Rugby; to their **MEDALS** made to special design, in silver, bronze, brass and tin; and to their **MORTUARY PAPERS**, which bear special reference to the deceased.

**J. H. and Co.** are also Workers in the Medieval Style of Furniture and Articles for Domestic use.

**LITHOGRAPHED FIRST COMMUNION CARDS, 100 per Hundred.**

**LONDON AGENTS—**

**BURNS AND OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.**

---

**PREPARATORY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG GENTLEMEN.**

**ST. STANISLAUS.**

**43a, HAMPSTEAD HILL GARDENS.**

**MISS FLON,**

A native of England, of French Catholic parentage, educated at the Convent de l'Interieur de Marie, at Montrouge, Paris, possessing her diplomas from the Hotel de Ville, and for several years engaged in tuition in England, Receives and Educates a few Little Boys, whom she instructs in English, Latin and French, and prepares for the lower forms of the Catholic public schools in England.

**TERMS—FIFTY GUINEAS A YEAR.**

*Miss FLON is permitted to refer to—*

The Lady Superior of the Convent de l'Interieur de Marie . . . . .	Montrouge, Paris.
The Most Honourable the Marchioness Dowager of LOTHIAN . . . . .	15, Bruton Street.
The Most Honourable the Marchioness of LONDONDERRY . . . . .	37, Grosvenor Square.
Lady ALEXANDER LENNOX . . . . .	12, Charles St., Berkeley Sq.
The Lady G. FULLERTON . . . . .	21, Chapel Street, Park Lane.
The Honourable Mrs. STONOR . . . . .	78, South Audley Street.
The Rev. Superioress, Convent of La Sainte Union des Sacrés Cœurs . . . . .	Highgate Road.
The Very Rev. B. Wilberforce, Prior, St. Dominic's, Haverstock Hill, N.W.	
The Very Rev. Fr. GORDON, late Superior of the Oratory, Brompton.	
The Rev. Fr. CHRISTIE, S.J. . . . .	111, Mount Street.
The Rev. G. A. OLDHAM . . . . .	St. Mary Magdalen, Brighton.
The Rev. A. D. Purcell, St. Mary's, Hampstead, N. W.	
Dr. H. GUENEAU DE MUSSY . . . . .	15, Rue du Cirque, Paris.
Dr. TEBAY . . . . .	37, Belgrave Road.
Dr. WEST . . . . .	61, Wimpole Street.

Holidays at Midsummer, Christmas, and Easter.

*The year is divided into three Terms, each of which is payable in advance.*







## *A Catholic Congress.*

---

"EVERYWHERE people are asking, with a feeling of disquiet, When shall we see the end of the days of tribulation? When? I will tell you—when the demonstrations of piety which are made inside the churches are corresponded to by active works practised outside them."

These grave words are reported to have been spoken by the Holy Father, Pius the Ninth, on the last feast of the Immaculate Conception, to an assembly of pious ladies who had come to present him with an address. He bade them thank God for having given them the spirit of good works as well as that of prayer, because without good works prayer lacked efficacy. He said that the cause why so many evils at present existed in Europe was that prayer was not accompanied by work and action, and that he saw in many countries a disposition to do no more than to pray. It certainly can never have been the intention of the Pope, nor of such a Pope as Pius the Ninth, to discourage prayer. His whole reign has been a continual action of faith supported by prayer. But he desires to see prayer accompanied by action, and he predicts that the days of evil will cease when Christians are roused throughout the length and breadth of Europe to an activity for good which may correspond to their prayers, and counterbalance the restless activity for evil which is the characteristic of the enemies of the Church, who never pray, unless it be to Satan. We have no wish, nor should we presume could we have the wish, to extend the meaning of the Holy Father's words beyond its natural range. Still, we cannot be mistaken in considering them as complementing other words which have so often fallen from his lips in these latter times, exhorting his children in the faith not to let the evil days discourage them, but, on the contrary, to gather from them the lesson which Providence intends them to learn from such visitations—the lesson of earnest prayer in the first place, and, in the second, of continual

laborious exertion in every sphere of activity or influence open to them, in order that the human part of what is to secure the great triumph of the Church, to which we are so often taught to look forward, may not be wanting.

The persecution of the latter half of the nineteenth century is daily assuming larger proportions. The brutality of language and of action which has characterized it in the last few months may be a sign that it is drawing to its final and convulsive effort in open bloodshed, but it is idle to deny that for the moment the virulence of the passion which it displays is only exceeded by the universality of the means which it employs. The Prussian Emperor, drawing near to the close of a long life, the greater part of which has been honourable, has condescended in a public document to calumniate many millions of his Catholic subjects by a charge which has been convicted of falsehood in his own Parliament. What would be said in this country, say, if Queen Victoria were to publish a letter to another sovereign in which she accused her Catholic subjects in England and Ireland of disloyalty and disaffection in the support of a national war, in which it was notorious that they had shed their best blood and had exerted all their influence to procure her allies and assistance? Such a charge would be no worse and not more utterly false than the charge which the Emperor William has publicly made against his own Catholic subjects. What would be said in this country if the Government were to send some of the Anglican bishops into exile, confiscate their revenues, turn out of their parishes the clergy who held any intercourse with or remained faithful to them, force parents to send their children to schools taught by apostates from Christianity, and impose on the clergy in general an official oath inconsistent with their religion? This would be nothing more than has been done and is being done in many of the Swiss cantons, with the additional aggravation that it is done by a Government bound by solemn treaties and fundamental acts of union to respect the rights of conscience and protect the free exercise of the religion which is thus persecuted. But we must be careful in asking the question, What would be said in this country, as to such language and such acts, knowing as we do that before these lines are published a great meeting of so-called "Liberals" may be held in London under the auspices of the author of the Durham Letter, to congratulate the German Emperor—among other things, we suppose, upon

his courageous assertion<sup>1</sup> with regard to his Catholic subjects? And it is hard to suppose that the sympathies of the meeting will not be claimed for the action of the Swiss Government. That such a meeting should be ventured on shows the extent of Prince Bismarck's influence in England, and we cannot be wrong in supposing that his intention is not simply confined to an expression of sympathy from Lord Russell and others, without further action in the direction of whatever amount of persecution the English public may be ready to permit.

But we are not now to speak of the various ways in which the fury of the persecuting spirit is at present manifested, except in so far as such phenomena may be considered as pointing the lesson, which the Holy Father has so often inculcated, of the necessity of action of every legitimate kind on the part of Catholics, and indeed, of all lovers of truth and justice. Nor do we intend to enter on the difficult question of the political action which may most conduce to the service of the Church; nor again, on that of the energetic use of all the means which ordinarily influence public opinion, which is a paramount duty to us in a country in which we are still free. The Holy Father's language may be supposed to refer more directly to good works of every kind, such as are within the reach and range of duties

<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt at all that the charge made by the Emperor in his letter to the Pope is, to speak plainly, absolutely false, and it breathes the worst spirit of Caesarism—that Caesarism one of whose earliest ministers, on a certain memorable occasion, uttered the words, "What is truth?" with a contemptuousness worthy of the most corrupt organ of the Prussian "Press Department"—that a misstatement of such a nature should be thought safe and politic in the mouth of the sovereign of a great country. The charge amounted to nothing short of treason—but no attempt has been made to prove its truth, or to meet the indignant challenge of Bishop Ketteler that an opportunity should be given of testing its truth. The opportunity however came, despite of Prince Bismarck, and we give the account of the occurrence from the *Spectator* of December 27. "It is curious enough that within the last week or two a very remarkable piece of evidence has come to light, showing, what we have always contended, that though the Bavarian Catholics were vehemently 'Particularist,' and opposed to German unity, the Prussian Catholics were loyal, till the Prussian Government made them otherwise. [We doubt the power of the Prussian Government to do this.] In the Prussian Diet, Herr Reichensperger has declared that the Prussian Ultramontanes used all their influence to get the Bavarian Catholics to break the resolution to which the Bavarian Legislature had come to be neutral in the war of 1870. He was challenged by cries of dissent from the Liberals, and then said that his assertion was not only true, but within the knowledge of some Liberals present, and he appealed to Herr Lasker for confirmation, who, to the great astonishment of his party, is reported as replying, 'Very true'—*Sehr wahr*. The letter of a correspondent, printed in another column, gives the exact words of the speech referred to. Herr Lasker is a final authority in such a matter, and by his assertion the most important statement in the Emperor's letter to the Pope is seriously discredited." [The italics are ours.]

of all, laymen as well as ecclesiastics, the humblest members of the Church as well as her highest rulers. And, putting aside simple acts of Christian virtue, works of mercy, charity, and the like, which do not necessarily need organization, and so shun publicity, we find a large range of work for the Church as to which it may be worth while to speak, for the very reason that it embraces so many heads as to which it is all-important that Catholics should learn to act together.

We may take, as a convenient text for our remarks, the lately-published Report of the *Assemblée Generale des Comités Catholiques de France*<sup>2</sup> (1873). The meeting whose proceedings are here chronicled took place last May in Paris, and occupied five days, the 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 24th of that month. The meeting, as is implied by its name, was not a mere "congress," in the sense in which that name is now commonly used. It was not an assembly, that is, which represented no organization but itself, and the work of which began and ended with its own meeting. It was more like the meetings of the British Association among ourselves, in this respect, than the Church Congresses, of which our Anglican fellow-countrymen are becoming so fond. In this, we consider, it may be an example to us, as well as in many of the details of the various *œuvres*, of which an account is given in the Report now before us. There are some characteristics of the position of Catholics in France which are not to be found in our own case. There are some works of zeal which our own smaller numbers put beyond our reach. Again, we have special objects and struggles of our own in consequence of the state of the law in our country, and of our position with relation to the State and the various bodies, local and municipal, in whose hands the decentralized system of English government has placed authority. There are also certain ways of doing and promoting good which are more French than English or more English than French. The English "meeting" is an enigma to our friends the other side of the Channel, and it may be doubted whether we should make much of the *salon des œuvres* so agreeably described in the volume before us by M. Antonin Rondelet. Still, we may learn very much from our brethren abroad, without feeling obliged to the perpetual and invariable repetition of Sterne's formula, "They manage these things better in France." The French organize more than we do. They are born organizers,

<sup>2</sup> Paris : Rue de l'Université, 47.

and may overdo it. We are naturally slipshod, independent, haphazard workers, we begin and do not go on, and half a dozen of us sometimes begin the same thing and waste in rivalry, or even jealousy, the energies which would be far better employed in a harmonious division of labour. Some of us are as anxious to do everything ourselves, and let no one else into the field, as our worthy friend Bottom the weaver was ready to play Pyramus and Thisbe and the lion all at the same time. If the French overdo organization, we underdo it; and we shall not be the worse for a little study of their example in the matter, though we are not bound to imitate them in everything.

The Report of the *Assemblée Generale des Comités Catholiques de France*, for 1873, gives a list of between six and seven hundred members, as either present at the meetings in May or adhering to them. The number of Committees thus represented is not given, but the Preface tells us that there are about forty which are in full and energetic work, while a much larger number are in various less advanced stages of activity and development. A glance over the long list of members enables us to see that though there are many noble and distinguished names on the roll, there is also an abundance of men of the middle classes. The lay element largely predominates. The only French bishop who took any part in the meetings was the Archbishop of Paris, in whose diocese they were held; but Mgr. de Segur and the Vicar-Apostolic of New Caledonia also addressed the members. This does not imply, we are assured, any indifference on the part of the French episcopacy to the work which is being done by the Committees. On the contrary, when put by the side of the kind encouragement which the bishops give to the whole movement, the fact shows how entirely they trust the members in their own sphere, and that they consider it the wisest and most fruitful policy to leave a large mass of matters relating to the interests of religion almost entirely in the hands of the laity as to management and promotion.

The works of zeal and charity which fall within this wide range may be gathered from an enumeration of the papers, or speeches, or plans, which occupied the time of the several meetings which are chronicled in the Report of which we are speaking. At the same time it might be observed that what may be called the great *œuvres de zèle* are already well estab-



lished in France, and do not so much need the active promotion which the members of these Catholic Committees bestow upon other less developed works. Thus the Peter's Pence Association, the work of the Propagation of the Faith, and the work of the Holy Infancy for the rescue of children, do not appear prominently in the Report of these meetings. The Sunday Observance, the Pilgrimages, and much that relates to higher and primary education, are not altogether absent, but they are not the chief subjects of the papers or reports—indeed, there was a special congress held last autumn on the subject of education alone, as to which there is just now a great deal of activity in France. It is understood to be the duty of the members of these Committees to support and propagate all these great objects, and, further, to be obedient instruments of the bishops whenever they are employed by them. In private life they are of course bound to live as good Christians and Catholics.

In public life [says the Preface] the members ought to be witnesses to Jesus Christ, and to fight every day and every hour for the divine cause. They ought to take part in political action so far forth as it is social; to become, by following resolutely a Christian path, instruments of regeneration; to enter into elective assemblies in order to defend the interests of religion, and for the same purpose into the local delegations *d'enseignement* (we may almost translate the word "school boards"). They are bound in conscience, both by the love of religion and by the public interest, to exercise, according to their means, a directive influence in the aid of good; they must neglect no just means of this, from the *œuvres* which are devoted to the labouring classes up to the propagation of good books and good papers (Preface, iii.).

The writer goes on to say that the development of all this class of work requires serious studies, and that the practical object of the reunions which are held from time to time requires that matter should be prepared beforehand, and then put forward for discussion. This remark explains the character of many of the papers read at the *Assemblée Générale* of 1873, which are often highly suggestive, and refer to new developments of Christian zeal which have as yet to be more fully organized, while others are essays of great interest, on such matters, for instance, as the old system of schools in France before the first Revolution, or on the momentous question of increase or decrease of the population. We find at the end of the volume a number of reports which had been prepared, but which there was no time to read, and among these there



are many of the highest importance and interest. If these are added to the papers actually read, and the speeches actually made, we shall have a long and tolerably exhaustive list of the subjects as to which the activity of the Catholics in France is at present occupied, at least in the way of new organizations and projected movements. The first day's meeting, on May 19, was mainly occupied with preliminary harangues and discourses, but there was time for a report from M. Dupont, representing a Special Commission on Charitable Works. He informed the *Assemblée* that his Commission was occupied on a number of subjects, two of which had not yet passed beyond the stage of preliminary studies, and when we learn that these subjects were of Public Help (as we understand it) to labour in the country, and Mendicity, we are not surprised that they had not yet arrived at maturity. Three reports, however, were ready, one on Foundling Children, another on the Work of Children in Manufactures, and a third on Agricultural Orphanages. The paper already mentioned on the Depopulation of France belongs to the same Commission of "Economie Charitable." The paper on Agricultural Orphanages is an interesting account of the "Colonie de la Nativité," at Servas, not far from Alais, and nothing can be less speculative and more practical.

The second day's meeting (May 20) entered on a large number of equally practical subjects. M. Rohault de Fleury read a report on the state of the question of the Observation of Sunday by the cessation of labour, and he was able to tell his audience that important steps had been taken for the promotion of this object. The Ministers of War, of Marine, and of the Interior, had either promised their support in the Cabinet, or had actually carried out the much desired reform as far as concerned the work of their own departments. More than this, a *projet de loi* had been presented to the National Assembly, and had been very favourably reported on; M. Chesnelong, a deputy who presided at the *Assemblée Generale* of whose proceedings we are giving an account, having been selected as "reporter" to the Legislature.

M. Chesnelong has since become famous for the part taken by him in the negotiations with the Comte de Chambord, and we are quite unable to say what has been the subsequent fortune of the *projet de loi* as to the Sunday. The next paper was by M. de Beaucourt on the subject of *Tracts*—for our neighbours over the channel seem to consider that "le tract," like "le

meeting," is an essentially English institution, so as to have a right to carry its name with it into France. The "tract" movement seems as yet to be in its infancy in that country, but we cannot doubt that the Catholics will soon be able to rival or even surpass the activity which seems to prevail among Protestants there as well as here in this respect. Then followed a very interesting historical paper by M. Fayet on the Elementary Schools in France before 1789. This paper we would willingly dwell upon, as it teems with facts, and although the researches of its author have been of necessity confined to one department of France, nothing can be more conclusive than the evidence adduced of the large provision made under the old *régime* for primary education. The same meeting of the *Assemblée Générale* listened to statements from M. Antonin Rondelet on the subject of the "Salons des Œuvres," a sort of conversational reunion for persons concerned in the propagation of good works of all kinds, as well as to a paper by M. de la Bégassière, on the organization of the "Cercles Ouvriers"—which we suppose would be translated in English by Catholic Working Men's Clubs—and a speech on the same subject by M. Albert de Mun, a young nobleman who has taken up the work with great enthusiasm. It would appear that it is assuming large dimensions, and requires a good deal of study and energy on the part of the promoters. Its programme includes lectures on social questions in a Catholic sense—not merely amusing or instructive lectures on general topics, which have nothing to do with the needs of the working classes, as is the case with some of our, more or less, similar institutions in England—as also the foundation of libraries—a central circulating library to begin with—and an organ, which again is not, as it appears, to aim at adding one more to the number of graceful little periodicals with which the press is already overstocked, but to deal in a manly serious way with the many questions relating to the working classes which require handling at the hands of able, hardworking, and thoughtful writers. We feel convinced that in these respects the managers of some of our Young Men's Associations might with profit consult the report of M. de la Bégassière and the speech of M. Albert de Mun. Concerts, dissolving views, excursions, and the like, are the very natural ornaments, so to speak, of a serious work like that undertaken by the promoters of these *Cercles Ouvriers*, and of the English societies which

to some extent move on parallel lines with them. But ornaments are not the solid substance of a work, though it is often much easier and much pleasanter to be ornamental than to be substantial. The serious character of the meetings of which we are speaking is one of their most salient characteristics. Shall we be forgiven if we say that there are no traces in the report of the influence of a female element in the audience? We do not know whether ladies were present or not, but we find no allusion to them, still less anything specially addressed to them. M. Albert de Mun's speech was followed by a speech of Mgr. de Segur, and this brought an end to the second meeting of the *Assemblée*. It would appear that no one had a better right to speak on such an occasion than Mgr. de Segur. He is the President of the "Bureau Central des Associations Ouvrières Catholiques" which meets in Paris, from one of whose publications we learn the interesting fact that there are no less than thirty different kinds of "Œuvres Ouvriers" at this moment at work in France.

The programme of the third meeting was not less extensive or less varied than that of its predecessors. The care of Foundling Children and the Œuvre des Patronages d'Apprentis, the objects of which are to preserve in faith and religion, and to advance in education, lads during the time of their apprenticeship, from thirteen to sixteen, thus dealing with some of the most dangerous years of the life of a young artisan, were the two first subjects of attention. Then there came a lucid report from Père Clair on the Congrès d'Enseignement Chrétien, of the last year, 1872, a congress which, as we have said, has been repeated and carried on in 1873. Then M. Léon Rouband gave an account of the work of the Catholic Committee of Marseilles, a Committee which seems to have distinguished itself above all others by its activity and success. It was hardly a year old when this report was made, and it may be safely recommended as a "Comité type"—a name given to it by the President of the *Assemblée*. Then came an account of what are called the Conférences de la Gironde, which appear to be an attempt to meet the club orators of atheism on their own ground, face to face. Here is an account of their origin—

Besides the action of the press, our department is the scene of a detestable propaganda carried on by word of mouth. Sometimes under the form of a private meeting, sometimes under that of conference (lecture), men penetrate into our country-places, into our most humble

communes, and set themselves to work to root out the last vestiges of religious faith. One man had distinguished himself above all in this propaganda of impiety; he went about falsifying history, working on every evil passion, and corrupting our whole department, commune after commune. A young priest, the curé of a very small parish, asked himself one day whether he was not to blame for leaving the apostle of evil uncontradicted. Obeying the ardour and courage of his nature, he presented himself at a meeting where these detestable doctrines were being preached. He put himself bravely face to face with the speaker, asked leave to speak, and discussed the questions raised with firmness and unvaried success, amid the enthusiastic applause of the audience, which, but a moment before, had been full of admiration at the eloquence of the first speaker. The curé followed him step by step, and gave him so much annoyance that he was soon obliged either not to announce his meetings, or not to let the subject on which he was to speak be known. The good which the Abbé Chavauty has thus done is incalculable. He has, in the first place, put a partial stop to the propaganda, and in the second place he has given courage to good men who, at first, were afraid to open their mouths, and who now have grouped themselves around him, and bear him company and support him in the holy struggle which he has undertaken.

The Committee of the Catholic Union of Bordeaux, witnessing these results, considered whether it would not be well to make the work general, and to appeal to all who felt in themselves the courage and talent necessary for undertaking it. The idea and plan has been very favourably accepted by the clergy, and by all whose thoughts are occupied with the present social dangers. We have been strongly encouraged to put it into execution, and our Committee has thought it best in the first instance to submit it to the *Assemblée* (p. 238).

The next subject brought before the meeting was connected with the Sunday question—the understanding between the employers of labour and the labourers themselves as to the observance of the Day of Rest. It appears that already the employers of labour are very generally inclined, in their own interests, to the suspension of work on the Sunday. The difficulty comes chiefly from the workmen themselves, who, in Paris and elsewhere, put pressure on their employers in order not to lose the wage of the day's work. It is, however, clear that even materially the labourers will not in the long run be losers by an arrangement which gives them the rest so necessary for their overtaxed strength, and the time to attend to their families and homes. It is urged, in the Report before us, that as many adhesions as possible should be secured to the proposal for the Sunday rest from the employers of labour in various forms, that the system of weekly payment of wages on Saturdays should be introduced, and other measures taken to secure the support of important bodies. It is curious to find

the statement boldly made that the greater number of accidents happen on Sundays and holidays, and that this is so true that it might well be proposed to the insurance companies to stipulate that the guarantees contained in their policies should not apply to such cases.

We find next a careful and interesting report by M. Guérin on the Pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and this meeting was then terminated by a few words from Cte. C. de Nicolai, who had just arrived from Rome, and had been told by the Pope to take his blessing to the *Assemblée*. The next day was the feast of the Ascension of our Lord, and about a hundred and twenty members assisted at Mass in the chapel of the Archbishop of Paris, most of them receiving Communion. The Archbishop delivered an affectionate address after Mass. Two more days of meeting remained, and a number of important subjects had to be crowded into them. The fourth meeting began with the reading of a letter from the Pope to Baron Chaurand, the deputy of the National Assembly who had introduced the Bill for the Observation of Sunday. Then came an account of the progress of the work for the Exposition and Nocturnal Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, followed by a report by M. Roussel on the subject of the rectification of false news, and the defence of the clergy in the press and before the tribunals. Certainly an *œuvre* more thoroughly in keeping with the needs of the present day can hardly be imagined. The next report was on Pilgrimages, giving an account of the commencement of what we must call the "movement" in that direction in the course of 1872, and of its further progress up to the time of this meeting in last May. It is of course notorious that since that time the development has been still greater. The English pilgrimage to Paray-le-Monial, one of the happiest, the most significant, and the most promising incidents of the last year among ourselves, was but one of a multitude of similar phenomena in France. We find Catholics in that country speaking already of their national pilgrimages to Rome, and to the Holy Land, and we may trust that we ourselves shall not be behindhand in such good works. They have their dangers in a time like ours, but these dangers are plain and easily obviated. Almost the most satisfactory feature in the English pilgrimage was that it was made at the cost of considerable hardships. Every one had a good deal to put up with and to suffer, and no one—except, perhaps, Mr. Cook—

could have made any money by the affair, In days when the conditions of ordinary travelling are so utterly different from the same conditions in old times, and when the transport of large numbers of people *en masse* to places of interest or amusement has become a common speculation, these conditions must be insisted on in order to make "pilgrimages" real works of devotion and self-sacrifice. There will always be a tendency to turn such expeditions, with all the modern appliances of special trains and the like, into pleasurable excursions of friends, got up, perhaps, not without an eye to a considerable, though unostentatious, profit to the funds of some society which happens to have a set of committee-men who are not afraid to treat their friends to a little pertinacious dunning and gentle intimidation for the sake of raising the wind. It would be better a thousand times that there were no pilgrimages at all than that they should be made with hampers of cold chicken and ham, and the other accompaniments of that ingenuous vanity, the pious picnic. This danger well guarded against, we hope to see the pilgrimage to Paray-le-Monial followed by many others, and the honour of God served, and the favour of the saints conciliated by a revival of the ancient devotion to many a long-profaned shrine, or by a thankful acknowledgment of merciful visitations vouchsafed in our own day, and let us hope, in our own country also.

But we are wandering from our text. By a somewhat abrupt transition, the audience which had listened to M. Bournisien about the *Œuvre des Pèlerinages*, were next called on to attend to a long and elaborate paper by Dr. Jousset on the Catholic Teaching of Medicine. Here again we come upon one of the great crying needs of the day. It is surely equally preposterous and mischievous that at this moment so large a portion of the medical teaching in Christian countries should be tainted by false principles as to man, according to which he is treated as a simple animal. "There is nothing repugnant," says a professor quoted by Dr. Jousset, "in admitting that matter, as it is arranged and combined in living beings, enjoys the property of producing the acts which we call life, without its being necessary to suppose any other agent in the body." How many medical schools are there throughout Christian Europe in which the practical effect of the teaching is anything different from the effect of this plain, unblushing, avowal of materialism? M. Jousset is not merely a querulous fault-finder with things as they are,



he has practical measures to propose, going so far as the establishment of perfect liberty of teaching in France, in the case of medicine, and he has a perfect programme of studies drawn out, which might be worth the while of the medical faculty of the Catholic University of Ireland to have an eye to.

After Dr. Jousset came M. Keller, the well known Catholic deputy, with a long speech, for he had written no report, on the *Œuvres Pontificales*, the good works established in aid of the Holy See; and he was followed by M. Recamier, with an elaborate paper which it is impossible to analyze, on the *aumonerie de l'armée*—the supply of chaplains to the army. The state of things in this respect appears to have been, perhaps it still is, very terrible—all the more so, in consequence of the manner in which the French army, like, as far as we are aware, all existing European armies except our own, is recruited by that detestable invention of modern Cæsarism, the conscription—an institution far more disgraceful to states that call themselves Christian than the slavery of Greece and Rome to states in which the "country" was deified. Here is a statement of the state of the case as it was, perhaps as it is, in France—

In time of peace, the organization of religious service in the army has always been since that time (1830) and is still at the present day almost imaginary. It is founded on an *ordonnance* which gives every facility to the most fatal interpretations. It has received some sort of development in particular places, owing entirely to individual initiation and the tolerance of the authorities, while at the same time it hardly existed at all in many central garrisons. It was, moreover, surrounded by restrictive measures which might easily be called hateful. It is enough to say that for many years it has been forbidden, by the most formal circulars to the ministers of religion, to address the Word of God to our soldiers, and that it was necessary, in 1864, to make the most active exertions in order to obtain for these ministers the right to make a short exhortation to the troops during the Mass. These circulars are in the archives of all the military divisions, and in those of Paris itself.

We have said that the actual organization of religious service in the army is imaginary. We cannot justify our expression in a more striking manner than in putting before you the organization as it appears in the Budget of 1874.

A certain number of *aumoniers*, assisted by *succursalistes*, are attached to the hospitals, the *ateliers* of public works, the penitentiaries, and the prisons.

There is an *aumonier* at the School of St. Cyr, an *aumonier* and a chaplain at the School of La Flèche, a curé and two *aumoniers* at the Invalides. This staff has seemed sufficient for the wants of what I may call the "undisposable," (*indisponible*) part of the army.

Besides, seven *aumoniers* are numbered among the staff of the great military stations. These have charge of the active army, or to speak more correctly, of the men present under the flag.

The total sum provided for religious services amounts to 113,876 francs, (between £4,000 and £5,000 a year), 101,040 francs of which are allotted to the *aumoniers* of the first class named above, and 12,838 to those of the second.

Thus, as far as the budget is considered, the whole religious staff of the active army amounts to seven *aumoniers*, who are distributed in stations far apart from one another, for whose expences 12,838 francs are provided. These figures might dispense us from all commentary, and we think that many persons will feel a painful surprise when they learn that in a country where the military bands cost 1,870,952 francs (not far short of £80,000), the active ministrations of religion seem to be secured by a sum of 12,838 francs (rather more than £500).

A certain number of devoted priests, profoundly touched by the state of things, and full of admirable charity and zeal, have undertaken the mission of evangelizing our soldiers. We see them every day, in the camps and in the towns, multiply themselves in order to place the succours of religion within the reach of the greatest possible number. They alone can tell what efforts and what perseverance it costs them to succeed in this, but every one ought to know that their existence is altogether precarious, and depends simply upon public charity, that they receive no support from the State, and they have only the right to exercise their holy and indispensable functions by means of the simple tolerance of the military authorities (pp. 329, 331).

No one can doubt that this miserable state of things, if prolonged, will do quite as much to prevent France from regaining her foremost place among the great European powers, in case of a general war, as all the battalions and big guns of Bismarck and Moltke. The proposals in the report from which we have been quoting are very practical as well as very sweeping. The report was followed by an energetic address from Père de Damas, of the Society of Jesus, on the "Apostolat de l'Armée."

But our space is fast slipping away, and we have yet a whole day of the meeting of the *Assemblée* to get through, as well as twenty or more reports to give an account of which were prepared but not read. We must hasten to an end, especially as our object is not so much to give a history of the *Assemblée* as to set forth its mode and line of action for possible imitation among ourselves. The last day of meeting had its time fully occupied by twelve or thirteen different reports, speeches, and proposals. The most important of these were perhaps the report of M. de Chateau Thierry on the "Associations Catholiques Ouvrières," already alluded to, the proposal of M. de Germiny for the establishment of free public



courses of lectures in the higher studies, to supply the great want of what we feel ourselves so much in need of, under the name of Catholic Universal Education, and the very interesting address of the Marquis de Fournès, on Catholic Publications. It appears from this last named report, that, not to speak of the efforts made in the provinces, there are in Paris itself four societies or publications which have for their object either to supply Catholics with good books at a low rate of price, or to guide them as to the character of the innumerable publications which issue from the press. There are many points in which these societies or publications might be imitated with profit by our Catholic reviews, even if we are not strong enough to have an institution of our own which may attend to this special object. In conclusion, we may point out the very great value of some of the papers which are contained in the category of "prepared but not read," which closes the volume on which we have been engaged. We have already mentioned M. Fayet's paper on the Population of France. M. Antonin Rondelet, one of the most active members of the *Assemblée*, contributes to this last class two of great importance, on the employment of Children at work and on a Programme for higher studies in literature. And, in the face of the iniquities lately consummated at Rome at the bidding of Prince Bismarck, we cannot help specially thanking the editor of the volume for giving us at full length M. Armand Ravelet's masterly "consultation" on the subject of the spoliation of the religious orders in the capital of Christendom—a specimen of clear legal reasoning, which can fail of its effect on no minds except those which are so entirely brutalized as to accept as their first principle that might makes right, and that Governments cannot be carried on except by mendacity and the violation of all engagements.

Such is a meagre and superficial account of this most interesting *Assemblée*. There are many papers in the Report which would well repay study, scarcely any that can be called unpractical, none at all that can be set down as mere idle speculations. It is obvious that the labours bestowed beforehand by the various Commissions, and by those members who had to prepare the several reports, give to the whole collection the high practical value and the tone of sober, well-considered earnestness by which it is characterized. The actual meetings of the *Assemblée* themselves reaped the fruit of much toil and thought, much industry and research. So

far, it may be said, that the *Assemblée* itself was merely an accident in the elaboration of the result in particular cases. But, on the other hand, it is clear that the arranging, combining, and stimulating force of the *Assemblée* itself and its chief managers must be credited with a large proportion of the fruits ultimately gained. But for the meeting in Paris it is possible that we should never have heard of many of these thoughtful projects and careful summaries of facts, and that, not only should we not have heard of them, but in many cases they would never have been made. An extemporized meeting for the mere purpose of talking about a subject which requires much preparation and deliberation beforehand, would probably often be useless, and might issue in mischief if its conclusions had to be acted upon. But a meeting which is content, in great measure, to listen to a well-selected series of practical essays on points which have occupied the attention of special Commissions for weeks or months, can hardly fail to be of great advantage to the cause which its members have at heart. Even though it has no time for discussion, the ideas which are set forth by the several speakers cannot but gain, if they are worth anything, by being well ventilated ; but the greatest gain, perhaps, is to the workers themselves, while the instincts of Catholic unity, as well as the blessing which is specially promised to united action, cannot fail to operate on all present in clearing away difficulties, in getting rid of idiosyncratic fancies, in eliminating crotchets, in maturing the plans of prudence, in encouraging and elevating hope, and in kindling to a brighter flame the heavenly fire of charity.

We wish a thousand blessings on the earnest and devoted members of these *Comités Catholiques* in France. Their great country has not yet emerged from the cloud which has fallen upon her for the follies and wickedness of the Second Empire, but she has the mark of the Cross upon her, as well as the still unforfeited character of the eldest daughter of the Church. And labours such as these undertaken by the Catholic laymen, who form the great majority of the members of these Committees, must hasten on, according to the words of Pius the Ninth with which we began, the day of regeneration for France, and of liberation and triumph for the Church. Our own circumstances, for the moment, are externally different from theirs, but the warfare of the Church is much the same everywhere, and there is scarcely one of the many objects which have engaged the

labours of these Committees in which we ourselves are not called on to take an immediate interest. How soon we shall see a Catholic Congress in England we cannot tell, but we feel sure that it would be as great a mistake to suppose that we have not the materials to form such meetings, as to think that we have no need for labours such as theirs. No doubt a congress of true-born Britons, on the manifold works of Christian charity among ourselves, might present some difficulties as to management. We should have our crotchetty men, our men of one idea, our button-holders who are always asking why every one else does not do something, our men of misguided energy, our men whose energy is mainly employed in making other people work for them. There is no reason for supposing that such troubles as these are confined within the shores of our own four seas, or that other people have found them insurmountable. But we want few things more than to know our own strength, to understand how to work in harmony, and to gain perseverance and confidence as well as strength from union. There is a great deal of work and a great deal of thought in our small body, and we are thus secured against the want of that preliminary labour and devotion without which it would be useless to collect any number of persons together in such a meeting as that which we have been describing. Timidity is one of our greatest dangers, because it leads to pusillanimity, and to the endeavour to gain our just rights by "arrangements" with the powers that be or with political parties. We shall do very well, by the mercy of God, when we have once persuaded ourselves that our enemies are not so very gigantic, and that our own strength, or rather the strength of our holy cause, is not so very puny after all. Our first Congress might be weak, and its results comparatively small, but our second and our third would be displays of power which they had themselves helped to create. We do not want for jealousies as it is, now that we work with so little of organization, but the more our common object is made clear to us, and the means of gaining it are arranged, the more thoroughly harmonized and united will be the hearts which are bent on pursuing it, the greater a hundred-fold the force which they will be able to direct to its attainment.

## *Modern Academics.*

---

ABOUT three quarters of a mile north-west of ancient Athens, on the river then called the Cephissus, stood a plot of ground, with a gymnasium standing upon it, bearing the name of the Academy. To a Greek of the age of Pericles, the name recalled the memory of one Academus, who of yore betrayed a state secret to the twin brethren, Castor and Pollux, when they came with hostile array against Attica. A modern ear, at the sound of Academy, is disturbed with the remembrance of the stunning question of education. But it is not with the ancient Academus, nor with the modern "young gentlemen" who need educating at "terms moderate," that this paper has to do. The Academy is interesting to us, because it was there that Plato taught.

Socrates and Plato were, as Mr. Grote has truly termed them, reformers. They were of the number of those men who have risen up to teach the world that the world is wrong. Their course lay against the stream; their function was, in the first place, opposition. Perhaps no mere human reasoner is so unworldly—I had almost said, so unearthly—as Plato. Much of what he has written is directed towards putting down those opinions and maxims which commonly rule the earth. Socrates' conversations appear, by all the accounts that we have of them, to have been still more purely polemical. The one knowledge that he boasted of was that of his own ignorance. However, there is every reason to believe that Socrates taught some positive dogmas, for instance, the position that knowledge is virtue. The dogmatism of Plato, particularly in his later works, is well known. Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemo, and Crates, handed down the dogmas of Plato; and because he had taught in the place sacred to Academus, his successors were called the Academics. But a hundred years after Plato's death, the sceptre of his authority passed into the hands of Arcesilaus; and he, if the metaphor may be allowed, altered the philosophic monarchy into a republic—that is to say, he taught that men had no

certain hold of truth, and that the one course open to teacher and scholar, from first to last, was to doubt. The universal claims of doubt were vigorously pressed by Carneades, who succeeded Arcesilaus. From this time forth, the designation Academic came to signify *sceptic*. Arcesilaus and Carneades took hold of the destructive part of the reasoning of Socrates and Plato, and made that their whole philosophy; and they denied that any other but that negative teaching ever had been sterling coin in the Academy. The distinguishing feature of the wise man, in their idea, was a universal suspension of judgment. But, they added, "there are two ways of saying that the wise man withholds his assent; one way it may be meant that he assents to nothing at all; in another way, that he refrains from answering either approvingly or disapprovingly, and thereby never commits himself either to an affirmation or a denial. This being the case, the Academics taught, on the one hand, that assent should never be given; and, on the other hand, they held that a man should follow probability, and answer yes or no according as a probable reason did or did not present itself for the case in question."<sup>1</sup> They repudiated all certain knowledge, but they did not profess absolute ignorance. They did not consider mankind to be quite so much in the dark upon all other points, as upon the question of the number of the stars, whether it is odd or even. Upon that point, no man can form even a probable conjecture, but we can attain to probabilities elsewhere. So the Academics affirmed; and further, they taught that we can attain to nothing beyond probability, to no knowledge that thoroughly excludes the chance of mistake.

One century and a half after Carneades, the world entered upon a new era. Christianity overtopped philosophy; faith dispelled doubt. The wail of uncertainty and perplexity ceased from off the earth. The Orient from on high was come, and in His light men saw the light. Reason's gaze was steadied and strengthened by revelation. But the change that Christ wrought was too good not to be opposed. He appears in prophecy as "a sign to be contradicted." And contradicted He has been, disbelieved, derided, and crucified. Infidelity is no surprise; the Bible foretells it; but it is a grief and a sorrow. The site of the Academy, for all I know, is now desert and silent; there is no sound of Carneades there. And his name is not often breathed anywhere in modern ears. But his habit of doubt

<sup>1</sup> Cicero's *Academics*, 32.

still prevails. I am about to discuss sundry sayings of one thoughtful Academic doubter of our time.

Mr. W. R. Greg has written a book entitled *Enigmas of Life*, the third edition of which is before me. In two remarkable pages, 226, 227, he observes that certainty alone produces martyrs; that every religion professes to have certainty on some point or points, and contradicts every religion which teaches an opposite doctrine, and that all religions err in common in the claim which they each and all lay to the possession of certain truth. "*In this*," he writes, "*they all lie. It is just this special claim to certainty* (to absolute authoritative truth) *which is the inspiring and life-giving power of all religions, which is also the one false element common to them all.*"<sup>2</sup> He instances how the European contradicts the Oriental, the Christian the Pagan, the Jew the Christian, the Protestant the Catholic, the Dissenter the Churchman, and how the philosopher contradicts them all, on the ground that "no such knowledge about the unknowable can ever be reached." Has it never struck Mr. Greg that he, and the so-called philosopher with whom he identifies himself, is no less of a dogmatist in matters of religion than the Jew, the Protestant, and the Catholic? They teach that the Messiah is or is not yet to come, that the Pope is or is not head of the Church; he maintains that there is no manifest Messiah and no visible Church, either actual or possible. He is committed to an assertion as much as they are. Why then does he take up a superior position, as though their opinions could severally be contradicted, but his cannot? Infidelity is just as much a form of dogmatism as faith. How does Mr. Greg prove that the things of God are unknowable?

I cannot tell whether or no he is an Academic upon all subjects; that is to say, whether he absolutely repudiates all certainty. But an Academic in religion he certainly is. Take the following sentences from pages v. and vi. of his Preface. "Of actual *knowledge* we have simply nothing. Those who believe in a Creative Spirit and Ruler of the Universe, are forced to admit that they can adduce no proofs or arguments cogent enough to compel conviction from sincere minds constituted in another mould." Now theologians do not profess to compel conviction from any mind. If faith were a matter of compulsion, it would never have been said by the Author and Finisher of faith—"He that believeth shall be saved; but he

<sup>2</sup> Italics not mine.



that believeth not shall be condemned." No man is either rewarded or punished for doing what he is compelled to do. All that theology can accomplish is to put forward the divine truth; to embrace it, or to reject it, is left to the will, aided by grace, of each individual believer. Faith is not to be received with folded arms, but with arms outstretched. It is not a thing for a man to boast of, that he cannot make up his mind what to do, or what to believe. Incredulity is as helpless and as silly as indecision; and lack of belief is no more praiseworthy than idleness. It is not then a question of compelling minds, sincere or insincere. But what instructed theists profess to be able to do, is to lay before a sincere mind sufficient reason why it should move itself, in accordance with the grace of God, to believe without doubting in a Creative Spirit and Ruler of the Universe.

Mr. Greg informs us that the belief in God in his mind amounts to "almost a certainty." May the time come to him in this life, as it shall assuredly come in the next, when he shall be quite certain of that fact, the first point of human knowledge! The belief in "a renewed life hereafter" is to him "a solemn hope." He writes on this subject, at page ix. of his Preface, "Those who cling most lovingly to faith in a future life, and would avoid the shocks which close thought always causes to it, would do well to guard against every temptation to define or particularize its nature, mode, or conditions, to realize its details or processes, to form a distinct or plausible theory regarding it, especially a local, physical, or biological one. Let it rest in the vague, if you would have it rest unshaken." The Church is not, and science is not, nor is any wise Christian, a friend to beliefs in the vague. The Church doctrine of heaven and hell is very definite, so far as it goes. The good shall be for ever happy in the sight of that God in Whom they have heretofore believed; while the wicked shall be for ever miserable, feeling what they have lost in being banished from the face of Him in Whom they have not believed, or, believing in Him, have not kept His commandments. In seeing God all bliss centres; the abiding, conscious privation of His countenance is the sum of utter woe. "Let me see the King's face, and so let Him kill me." The saints live in the vision of the King in His beauty; the damned are everlastingly dying for want of Him. By our Saviour in the Gospels hell is described mainly as a place of

fire and of the gnawing worm, "where their worm dieth not, and the flame is never extinguished." Heaven is a kingdom; "possess ye the kingdom that is prepared for you." A Christian, reading these words, will not deny that there is fire in hell. But the worst and sharpest edge of that fire is surely not any material burning, though such there be; the worst is the cruel truth of which the soul can never divest her memory, that she by her own fault has irrevocably lost her God, her sole satisfying contentment and repose. This is the gnawing worm, with a sharper tooth than a serpent's, the thought of the loss of Him with Whom all is lost. And reasonable it is that they who wilfully and outrageously offend God should lose Him eternally. Thus far, at least, it is not rash "to define or particularize" the "nature, mode, or conditions" of the future life.

Before the article about "life everlasting" there is proclaimed in the Creed what Mr. Greg, in the spirit of an ancient Athenian,<sup>3</sup> calls "the astonishing doctrine of the resurrection of the body."<sup>4</sup> The authors of that doctrine, he thinks, were "innocent of all science, and oddly muddled in their metaphysics." He styles the doctrine "absurd, indefensible, and virtually impossible." One might expect that some mystery of modern science, utterly unknown to the Apostles, furnished the groundwork of this vehement language. It was excusable, eighteen hundred years ago, to think of the dead rising again, but such and such a discovery recently made, and recorded in the *Philosophical Transactions*, so we should fancy Mr. Greg arguing, renders the belief ludicrous. Nothing of the sort, there is no appeal to any modern discovery, to anything that the Court of the Areopagus did not know when St. Paul preached before them. The resurrection of the body is written down as absurd, only because "the buried body soon dissolves into its elements, which in the course of generations and centuries pass into other combinations, form part of other living creatures, feed and constitute countless organizations one after another." If Mr. Greg will turn to St. Thomas' *Summa Contra Gentiles*, book iv., chapter 81, he will there find one form of his objection stated in the following manner—

It happens sometimes that some men feed on human flesh, and make that their only nourishment, and being so nourished they have children. Therefore the same flesh is found in many men. But it is impossible that it should rise again in many, nor yet does it appear that the resurrection can be universal and entire, unless to each one is restored what he had here. Therefore the future resurrection of mankind appears an impossibility.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xvii. 32.

<sup>4</sup> Preface, pp. x., xi., xii.

In the next chapter the saint answers himself.

It is not necessary that whatever was in man materially should rise again in him, and besides, if anything is wanting, it may be made up by the power of God. The flesh therefore that has been eaten will rise again in him in whom it was first perfected with a rational soul ; but in the second man, the cannibal, if he has not fed on human flesh alone, but on other flesh as well, there can arise as much of such other material as has accrued to him as shall be needed to supply the due complement of his body. But if he has fed on human flesh alone, there will rise again in him that which he has derived from his parents, and the deficiency will be supplied by the omnipotence of the Creator. But if his parents also have fed on human flesh also, so that their seed, the surplus of their nourishment, has been formed out of other men's flesh, in that case the seed will rise again in him who has been born of the seed, and in place of it other substitution will be made to the man whose flesh has been eaten. For the rule of the resurrection will be, that any material which has entered into the composition of a number of men will rise again in him to whose perfection it rather belonged ; so that if it has been in one man as the radical seed whereof he was engendered, and in another as accessory nourishment, it will rise again in him who was engendered of that seed. But if it has been in one as appertaining to the perfection of the individual, and in another as referred to the perfection of the race, it will rise again in him to whom it belonged as a point of his individual perfection ; hence the seed will rise again in the offspring, and not in the parent, and the rib of Adam will rise again in Eve, not in Adam, in whom it originally came to be. But if it has been as a point of like perfection in the one and in the other, it will rise again in him in whom it was first.

I should add that this explanation, and particularly the physiology of it, is no part of the faith of the Church. The Church proclaims the fact of the resurrection of the body, and leaves her children to devise the manner of its accomplishment as they can. But though we might differ from St. Thomas as to details of execution, his description leaves no doubt in an intelligent mind, that the general resurrection does not involve a contradiction in terms, and therefore is a possible work of Almighty Power. God can surely so arrange that, out of all the animal tissue that a human soul animates in this life, there should be enough to form a body for it at the last day, unclaimed by any one else. We do not suppose that the body wherewith an individual dies is in all its atoms the same with which he shall rise in judgment. St. Thomas probably was not aware how rapidly an organism changes. Every man who lives to any age assimilates into his body matter enough, if he retained it all, to swell him to the dimensions of a giant. Out of this colossus cannot God secure for him six feet that shall belong to no one else at the last day ? The progress of physiology, far from

embarrassing the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, seems to me to have facilitated its explanation.

To hold by this article of faith does not suppose men "innocent of all science," neither does it argue their being "oddly muddled in their metaphysics." Metaphysics, so far as we can use them, do not demonstrate the resurrection, neither do they conflict with it. The soul of Virgil is now the person that was Virgil on earth, two thousand years ago, and is reaping accordingly the reward of what Virgil then did. It is the same person, but not the same man, for "men are flesh and blood, and apprehensive," which flesh and blood Virgil at present is not. There is a certain convenience, but our natural reason does not show that it amounts to a necessity of fitness, that he who is requited in the next life, should be not only the same person, but also the same man, that did good and evil here. This is the utmost that metaphysics have to say about the resurrection of the body. The belief lies out of their province. The fact is not a fact of the natural order. *Stupebit natura, quum resurget creatura.*

Many things are astonishing, the marvel of which vanishes when the antecedent conditions are examined. While that examination, being possible, is not performed, it is impertinent to declare the assertion "astonishing," and therefore untrue. It would surprise me to hear that there was a man who claimed me for his slave, but if I further learned that my self-styled master was out of his mind, I should wonder and be incredulous no longer. The resurrection of the body is an "astonishing doctrine" to any man that is not a Christian. St. Augustine writes—"Upon no point is such vehement, pertinacious, obstinate and contentious contradiction offered to the Christian faith, as upon the resurrection of the body. For the immortality of the soul many, even of the heathen philosophers, have argued at length, and have bequeathed to memory their written declaration in many and manifold books, attesting that the soul of man is immortal. But when they come to the resurrection of the body, they do not hesitate, but contradict it flatly, and their contradiction goes so far as to say that it is impossible for this earthly body to mount unto heaven.<sup>5</sup> But believe that God has taken flesh, has died, and has risen again, that He operates upon our bodies with sacramental signs, with water, with oil, and even with the sign under which lies the substance of His own Body

<sup>5</sup> St. Augustine in Psalm lxxxviii., in verba illa, *testis in caelo fidelis.*

and Blood; then the wonder would be, not if He did, but if He did not raise us up at the last day. That resurrection will be for all, as the Incarnation was for all, and the Church is for all, directly for the good of all men, their souls and their bodies—indirectly, for the utter ruin, soul and body, of those men who in malice have spurned the gift of God.

Mr. Greg asks—"What could such incongruous elements as nitrogen and phosphates, and sodium, and other metallic bases, be doing in immaterial spheres and before the judgment-seat of God?" Perhaps he can tell what the said elements, as they exist in the body of man, are doing in connection with a thinking principle. To suppose that the next world lies wholly in "immaterial spheres" is to beg the question. Moreover, we have been taught to believe that "the judgment-seat of God" will be erected upon this earth. "Nitrogen and phosphates, and sodium, and other metallic bases," are expressions for certain aspects of matter which we have observed. But where is the evidence that we have seen all round matter, and know its capabilities under the hand of God so thoroughly, as to be able to foretell what the "spiritual body," with which St. Paul says we shall rise again, will be like? If matter has no spiritual affinities, how comes it that material objects, sea, mountains, woods, sky, light, and the "human face divine," are beautiful?

Mr. Greg in this place shows a Platonic abhorrence of what is bodily. In heathen times, men made such vile uses of their bodies, that the brighter spirits among them were led to consider flesh and blood as something essentially and intrinsically evil. The Church has had much ado, as well to sanctify man's body, as to make man esteem it as it deserves. On this ground she has fought with Platonism no less severely than with Epicurism.

Another reason for the resurrection of the body to a Christian is this, that Christ came to restore the ruin of Adam; now by Adam's sin came death, which the Redeemer therefore must destroy. He died to overcome it, whence it behoves His followers likewise to die, but He rose again, and death had no more dominion over Him. It remains that the hour shall come when the dominion of death over mankind shall be overthrown, when the victories of the great leveller shall be turned into defeats, and his icy touch shall freeze our limbs never again. Then and then only shall we be as though Adam had not fallen. The resurrection enters so essentially into the Christian scheme, that every fact of the economy of redemption appears to

bear upon it; but put Christianity aside, and the consummation looks hopeless and chimerical enough. Then there is room for the wail of the Greek poet—

When in the garden the herbs show shrunk and sere and yellow,  
Mallow and parsley and anise, that erst were so green and blooming;  
Yet do they rise up again, the delight of another season.  
But we, men of repute, or for stature, or strength, or wisdom,  
Once that the earth has closed over us, sleep in her silent chambers,  
Buried for ever and aye, in a slumber that knows no waking.<sup>6</sup>

Mr. Greg makes use of two expressions which puzzle me, about the soul being "*called up from somewhere to re-inhabit pro hac vice the body*," and about decayed and dispersed elements being "*put together once more for one momentary function*."<sup>7</sup> I hope he is not ignorant that the reunion of soul and body is believed to endure not merely for the single occasion or momentary function of the general judgment, but for all eternity after that. True indeed it is that the impugnors of religion stand in need not so much of polemics as of catechetical instruction. They know not what they attack; half of their unbelief consists in ignorance.

Life is full of enigmas, and must ever be so to an intellect that has not the blessed vision of the Godhead, for in that alone is the explanation found. Next to actual sight, which is not possible to mortals, faith in God is the best solvent of the problem of existence, and the solution which faith affords is enough for all practical purposes in this world. But without faith the enigmas of life are hopeless puzzles, puzzles which we cannot afford to overlook, for they concern us nearly, so that we must fain be tortured by them. That Mr. Greg feels this torture keenly, his book amply proves. It is painful in many parts to read, for the vivid representation which it bodies forth of evil. It is like those medical treatises, where the pains and symptoms of diseases are described without their remedies. Mr. Greg indeed has many remedies to propose, all of them however insufficient, because they are merely human, and the misery of

<sup>6</sup> αἱ αἶ, ται μαλάχαι μὲν ὕταν κατὰ κᾶπον ὄλωνται,  
καὶ τὰ χλωρὰ σέλινα καὶ εὐθαλῆς οὖλον ἀνήθον,  
ὑστερον αὖ θάλλοντι καὶ εἰς ἕτος ἄλλο φέροντι.  
ἄμμες δ' οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ κάρτεροι ἢ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες,  
ὑπὸ κακὰ πρᾶτα θάνοιμες, ἀνήκοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλῃ.  
εὐδοίμε· εὐδ' μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον

(Moschus, iii. 106, seq.).

<sup>7</sup> Preface, p. xii.



man is too deep for man to cure. In the middle ages, there lived at Norwich a solitary named Juliana, whose thoughts ran much on the evil that is on earth. One day the Saviour of the world said to her—"I may make all things well, and I can make all things well, and I shall make all things well, and I will make all things well, and thou shalt see thyself that all manner of things shall be well." Here is the sole hope of humanity. Whoever labours on any other foundation to raise man's moral nature, labours in vain.

But Mr. Greg doubts whether God can make all things well. He takes the evil in the world for a proof that the Creator is not almighty. "Half of the difficulties," he says, "which lie in the way of believing in a Personal God as the Ruler as well as Creator of the universe are of our own making. They are wholly gratuitous, and arise out of the inconsiderate and unwarranted use of a single word—*Omnipotent*." And he asks, "What stateable reason, what quotable warrant, have we for assuming that the Creator was, or that the Supreme Being is, 'Omnipotent'?"<sup>8</sup> Our reason is simply this. The Supreme Being is not *primus inter pares*; He is over all being. He is of Himself, and nothing can be besides Him that is not of Him. If anything could be that was not of Him, that would be an independent existence, and God would be no longer the Supreme Being. Whatever therefore can be, He can make to be. What He cannot make to be, has no place within the possible compass of being. Such a thing is an absolute impossibility, an essential nonentity. It cannot be conceived by any mind; not by the Divine mind, for then God's understanding would surpass His power, a contingency which cannot have place in an all-perfect Being; nor can it be conceived by any created mind, for the mind of God is the measure and rule of other minds. A square circle, for example, cannot be conceived. We can conceive a square, and a circle, and a space inclosed by four several arcs of a circle, but not a space which shall be at once square and circular. The phrase is a contradiction in terms. God cannot give being to a contradiction, for that would be a denial of Himself. He cannot sin for the like reason. But everything in which there is no contradiction involved, that is to say, every conceivable positive act, God can do. Therefore He is, on this very just and adequate ground, honoured with the name "*Omnipotent*." It is no lack of power

<sup>8</sup> Preface, pp. xvi., xviii.

to be unable to accomplish an absurdity. Suppose with Mr. Greg, that a really almighty being ought to be able to "combine inherent contradictions," as to "cause two and two to make five."<sup>9</sup> And suppose it done. Then the contradictions might be combined and not combined at the same time; and two and two would be four, and also five, that is, four and one; so that four and one would be four and likewise five, and the one would thus be and not be. Is Mr. Greg serious in making the realization of this jumble a test of omnipotence?

"But," he urges, "seeing so much evil about me, I cannot believe that God is at once almighty, and all-wise, and all-good; and I had rather think His power limited than His wisdom or His goodness." I am not about to answer with a volume on the origin of evil. I stand by two simple principles, which I think are enough to account for evil without any curtailment of the majesty of God. In the first place, this world is not our final state, therefore we must not measure the good and evil of humanity by the pleasures and pains of this life, as Mr. Greg is inclined to do. He would have enjoyment pursued, and trouble and grief avoided, purely and directly for their present character as feelings. But if man is created to serve God, surely the service of his Maker should permeate all his likes and dislikes, and influence all his estimates of good and evil. Pleasure and pain are like other temporal things, good or evil, according as they are referred or not referred to the glory of God. This is the solution of the question about physical evil. Secondly, there is moral evil. Here the resolving principle is the assertion of the freedom of the will. Let there be no Calvinism here, or the honour of God is lost. Moral evil is evil, crime is crime, only so far forth as it proceeds from an agent who, under the circumstances, need not have committed the act. Whether the amount of guilt amongst men be so great as we sometimes suspect it is, the Searcher of hearts alone knows.

\* It is a significant fact that the attribute of omnipotence, which Mr. Greg refuses to the Deity, was also not generally recognized among the Pagan nations of old. There was no Greek word for *almighty* in the classical age. The Latin *omnipotens* is found in Virgil, but not in any exact sense. "Who would grant you that God can do all things?" are the words of a disputant in a philosophical dialogue of Cicero.<sup>10</sup> All

<sup>9</sup> Preface, p. xix.

<sup>10</sup> *Academics*, 16.

forces in nature are limited, and God to many of the heathen stood for that amount of force which they judged necessary for the working of the machinery of the world. Now unlimited mechanical force seems absurd. God, therefore, if He is what we English are fond of calling Him on all occasions, Almighty, must have other titles besides, expressive of personal attributes, such as Wise and Just. Omnipotence argues personality. Mr. Greg surprises me when he writes of "the difficulties which lie in the way of believing in a Personal God," arising out of the use of the word *Omnipotent*.

My strictures have hardly extended further than the Preface to the *Enigmas of Life*. Much might be said about the book itself. Its general character is expressed as well by the name which the author has given it, as by that which I have put at the head of this paper. It is the work of a man in doubt about the next world, and therefore inclined to make the most of this, not however without casting anxious glances "elsewhere." I contend that the only way successfully to cope with this world, is to have not vague surmises, but a certain faith, as to what there is to be found in the world of "elsewhere." I draw my proof from the experience of that Græco-Roman civilization in which the Academy flourished. We have made many improvements in the world since that day, and we have more in contemplation—Mr. Greg suggests not a few. But what have we done to improve ourselves? This is a difficult question to answer, for I wish to prescind from the influences of Christianity, seeing that the religion of the God-Man has no place in the modern scheme for the regeneration of mankind. Christianity apart then, how are we better men than the Greeks and Romans? This question should be answered before we let go our sheet-anchor, and drift out into the ocean of humanitarian progress under the captaincy of writers like Mr. W. R. Greg. Now any student who has read his Aristophanes, and Plato, and Thucydides, and Tacitus, and Juvenal, and Seneca, can tell of horrors which we should be loth to imitate, and can repeat moral lessons—the only moral lessons those ancients had—which fall cold on our ear. There is this advantage about a classical education, that it renders a man less sanguine about improving the world on philosophic principles. Many a doughty follower of Mill would be more reasonable in his expectations, if he had read with his own eyes how Plato tried and failed. It is not every classical student who learns this lesson of caution

—Mill himself did not—but the lesson is there. It will be a cold day I think when the world shall sit down to feed its moral nature with Seneca and Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius and Julian, setting aside the Gospel of him whom the Imperial apostate sneeringly called “good John.” I have tried to imagine to myself all Mr. Greg’s recommendations carried out—criminals really punished, marriage forbidden to the unhealthy, dyspepsia eradicated, undue exertion restrained—still I fear the worst from human passions whence has been removed the curb of a definite belief about sin and redemption, hell and heaven. The means proposed at pages 28 and 29, for the reduction of intemperance and of “the social evil,” seem vague and inadequate. They smell too much of Acts of Parliament. There is after all but one remedy. The tree that healed the Pagan nations of old still stands, the sap still rises in its trunk, it strikes out its roots and puts out its green leaves, visible in every land. “It was before the Deity embodied in a human form, walking among men, partaking of their infirmities, leaning on their bosoms, weeping over their graves, slumbering in the manger, bleeding on the Cross—that the prejudices of the Synagogue, and the doubts of the Academy, and the pride of the Portico, and the fasces of the Lictor, and the swords of thirty legions, were humbled in the dust.”<sup>11</sup> May modern Academics not be more stiff-necked than their sires of old!

J. R.

<sup>11</sup> Macaulay, *Essays*, I.

## *Studies in Biography.*

---

### II.—AN ABBOT OF THE TENTH CENTURY (PART I).

THE tenth century is a period on which a considerable amount of abuse has been heaped from very various quarters. It has come in not only for more than an average allowance of the condemnation which falls on all the dark ages from those who know nothing about them, and in whose opinion it may almost be said that enlightenment, cultivation, and civilization expired with Julian the Apostate and revived with Luther; but even Christian and Catholic writers have been somewhat too prone to speak of it in unmeasured terms of contempt. Baronius, followed by a swarm of others, characterizes it as an age of iron, of lead, and of darkness. The iron refers to its manners, the lead to its disorders, the darkness to the fewness of the writers who illustrate it.

There were good reasons enough, as history shows us, why the tenth century should not have been remarkably bright and flourishing in these respects; but it is quite possible that all this censure is founded upon little more than prejudice and hasty judgment. One of the chief accusations against this period has quite lately received a confutation of considerable power. The accusation to which we refer is this—that in the tenth century men's minds were deeply and universally possessed by alarm on account of the supposed imminency of the Day of Judgment. It cannot be denied that the approach of the thousandth year after the Incarnation would very naturally suggest to many minds the idea that the end of all things was at hand. Nothing is more certain from Holy Scripture, which registers the express declaration of our Blessed Lord Himself upon this subject, than that the time of the end of the world is a secret reserved to Himself by Almighty God. And yet there is an instinctive tendency in the human mind to round off the periods of the world's existence, whether it be looked at prospectively or retrospectively, in a way which

has no warrant from Scripture or authentic tradition. The time may come when this truth may have to be pointed out very distinctly in answer to discoveries which may make it probable that we have been accustomed to fix too precisely the date at which man appeared upon the earth, and, however this may be, it is certain that from the beginning of the Church the Apostles had to warn Christians against the opinion that the end was very nigh, and that evidence of the same opinion is to be found in almost every generation since the days of St. Peter and St. Paul. This irrepressible notion would naturally support itself, in the age of which we are speaking, by one or two texts of Scripture, which would seem to chime in with the instinctive readiness already mentioned to anticipate that the end of a thousand years must bring about a great and perhaps final crisis in human history. The disorders and miseries of the time were undoubtedly great, though they have been exaggerated, and their effect would be to confirm and deepen these gloomy anticipations. Few persons would have thought that another thousand years could be added to the space of the world's life, and so far there may have been occasions on which men may have felt the apprehension of the future pressing heavily upon them with a paralyzing influence rather than as a stimulant to exertion. Thus much may be allowed as natural and as consistent with history.

This much, however, will not satisfy the ill-balanced minds of anti-Catholic historians like M. de Sismondi and M. Michelet. We can hardly expect such writers to make much account of the Gospel prophecies as to the end of the world, one feature of which certainly is that the last day is to come upon mankind unawares, as the Flood in the time of Noe and the destruction of the Cities of the Plain in the days of Lot. But surely an ordinary acquaintance with human nature, which is not over-susceptible to alarms which may turn it from present enjoyments and the cares and interests which are merely visible and temporal, might have warned them against so preposterous a judgment as that which is expressed in the passages which we are about to quote. "One is frightened," says De Sismondi, "at the state of disorganization into which society was necessarily thrown by the belief of the imminent approach of the end of the world. The entire mass of mankind found itself in the mental condition of a condemned criminal who has received his sentence. All labour of body or mind became aimless."



"The miserable world of the tenth century," says M. Michelet, "was without hope after so many ruins." And again—"The captive in his dark prison, the serf over his furrow, the monk in the abstinence of his cloister, each was in a state of expectation—they had this appalling hope in them of the last Judgment." It is hardly necessary to point out that passages of this sort are aimed in great measure at the Church, which is supposed to have engendered or nurtured the superstition which thus paralyzed mankind. We are therefore, to the same extent, under obligations to writers who are at the pains to show how much of exaggeration there is in the picture thus drawn, as well as the part taken by the Church in regard of any extravagant expectation of calamity which may have existed among the men of the tenth century.

As to the question of fact, then, we may refer our readers to an interesting paper published in a late number of the *Revue des Questions Historiques*,<sup>1</sup> by a learned Benedictine of the Abbey of Ligugé, Dom Fr. Plaine. This article appears to us to set the question at rest, by destroying the principal foundation of the opinion expressed in so strong a form by Sismondi and Michelet. We can do no more here than shortly sum up its results. The author makes it clear, in the first place, that the supposed alarms of the men of the tenth century are not mentioned by any author earlier than the fifteenth, although there are, of course, many authors who ought to have mentioned them. The contemporary writers, in the second place, speak in a manner which is inconsistent with the truth of the supposition. A famous passage of Raoul Glaber, who states that in the early decades of the eleventh century there was a great movement in the direction of the restoration and building of churches, "as if the world itself had shaken off its old age, and had put on everywhere a white garment of churches," is shown to be no real support to the opinion as to the entire paralysis of all hopeful Christian activity in the preceding century. At this rate, indeed, we might as well say that the men of the eighteenth century were utterly frightened out of all exertion in the cause of extending religion by the terrors of the Day of Judgment, because our own century, which has followed on theirs, has witnessed so remarkable a development of church building and church restoration in so many countries in Europe. Again, another argument, drawn from the insertion,

<sup>1</sup> *Revue des Questions Historiques*, January, 1874.

common in the tenth century, of words about the approaching end of all things in the preambles of charters and public documents, is shown to be invalid, because the formula in question was introduced as early as the seventh century. Finally, the learned Benedictine, whom we are epitomizing, shows us by actual historical facts that there was plenty of healthy activity both of soul and body in the period in question, and especially about the fatal year itself, the thousandth of the Christian era.<sup>2</sup>

The real character of the tenth century must be judged of from its history, and without going at any length into its not very brilliant or attractive annals, we may content ourselves, as recommended by the Benedictine author of whom we have spoken, with the biography of one of those children of that century who have made themselves conspicuous enough to live in the records of human memory. A man who has greatly distinguished himself, so as to outstrip his contemporaries, may indeed be said to be in advance of the age in which he lives. Yet, on the other hand, a man may be superior to the common herd, using his talents for the improvement of his compeers, only occasionally meeting with others of his own standard in

<sup>2</sup> The late Dean Milman may be cited as a specimen of the English writers who have adopted, though with much qualification, the views of Sismondi and Michelet on this matter. "At the beginning of the century," he writes (*Latin Christianity*, bk. v., ch. xiii.), "the end of the world had been announced by a grave Council." [This is altogether a mistake. The Council in question was the Council of Trosly A.D. 909, and the passage on which the assertion is founded is simply a moral passage like many that may be found in sermons and similar discourses. The bishops speak of the weight of their pastoral office "dum instat reddenda ratio negotii nobis commissi cum exactione lucri et dum jamjamque adventus illius in majestate terribilis ubi omnes cum gregibus suis venient pastores in conspectum Pastoris Supremi."] "The end of the world at hand was publicly preached at Paris." Dr. Milman adds a note that "Abbo, the Abbot of Fleury, had heard this sermon in 990." [It was in 960, when Abbo was, as he says, *adolescentulus*, and a single sermon by a visionary, who was opposed at the time by Abbo himself, is no argument for the belief of the age. Dean Milman goes on,] "Men hastened to propitiate the coming, almost present, Judge, by the sacrifice of their ill-gotten, now useless, possessions. The deeds of the time, the donations of estates, and all other gifts to the Church, are inscribed with the significant phrase, the end of the world being at hand." [But this significant phrase had been in use for centuries before.] "But while these fears were lurking in the hearts of pious but obscure men, while they were darkening the dreams of holy recluses, and dictating the wills of penitent sinners trembling on the brink of the grave, the great men of Europe, the secular and ecclesiastical potentates, entertained no misgivings. In Italy, in Rome, the centre of Italy, these terrors were unknown. The Emperor himself, instead of apprehending the close, looked to the opening of the new millennium but as the dawn of a Western Empire, as vast and comprehensive, more firmly established, and more stably organized, than that of Charlemagne," &c.

intellectual gifts, and yet his history may be pointed to as vindicating the mental attainments of the age. Not that a single hero in any sphere can redeem a whole generation from the charge of ignorance or inferiority, but because such a man is generally only more prominent among others of his own stamp, because, also, he and they were appreciated by those of their own period, while at the same time each in his line exercised a beneficial effect upon all around him.

Such a man was the Abbot of Fleury, whose life we propose to sketch in this paper. Abbo was born about the year 940, or 945. It is true he adorned the century which gave him life, but in following his career we shall have ample proof that the tenth century was not quite so dark an age as it has been painted. There were many drawbacks even to the ordinary course of civilization. We have no need to fall back upon the imagined alarm as to the approach of the Day of Judgment as an excuse for inaction and torpor in the men of that time. Strange as it may seem to say it, there were other evil elements at work in opposition to all true progress which are by no means unknown to our own enlightened age, and which may perhaps, some centuries hence, be pleaded in extenuation of the condemnation passed upon ourselves for our neglect of sound learning and our backwardness in all the higher and nobler ranges of human thought. Our own times certainly show with an abundance of evidence that a period of political disruption is disastrous to the progress of literature. When anxiety is strained to the utmost for the latest scrap of intelligence, when the fate of a country seems trembling in the balance at every moment, there are few natures that can calmly devote themselves to questions of social or intellectual advance. What we now behold in so many countries was, in the tenth century, the condition of nearly the whole of Europe. The beneficial influence of Charlemagne's reign had been, as it were, worn out. In France, the nobles had become tyrants, almost sovereigns in their own domains, where their castles had become centres of oppression rather than of protection. The Kings, incapable of commanding, and therefore powerless to punish, were of less importance than many of their own vassals. The churches were desecrated, the monasteries pillaged or burned, the monks and clergy persecuted and massacred, so that ecclesiastical discipline necessarily became relaxed. Italy was in perpetual confusion, the Saracens assailing the coasts, the interior of the country in constant

disturbance from the want of a strong central and uniting power. In England the Church had become relaxed, and the Danish invasions were weakening the country in preparation for the Normans. Germany was exceptionally vigorous. The Christians in Spain were in a continual life and death struggle with the Mussulmans.

Amid all this warfare and confusion the arts and sciences could scarcely be expected to flourish, but the tenth century possessed a stronghold for peaceful avocations which the nineteenth century is eagerly trying to destroy. This stronghold was the monastic life. Dismissing for a moment the religious aspect of the case, we may surely claim gratitude for the monks of the middle ages, who not only persevered in cultivating the soil which they had themselves redeemed from vast forests, but who spent a still more precious portion of their time in scientific investigations, in the practice of the fine arts, or at least, in the multiplying of manuscripts.

Abbo is presented to our notice, not as an isolated specimen of energy combined with piety in the tenth century, but as a type of a class, and his last biographer<sup>3</sup> wisely gives us a brief notice of his predecessors in the Abbey of Fleury. This famous abbey had been founded in the seventh century by Albon, a rich lord who, as we are told, had left the Court of Bounehaut in order to attend to the affairs of his soul. Fleury, or Floriacum, had been a grand Roman villa, built in a charming valley on the banks of the Loire, at some leagues distance from Orleans. The Romans had named the valley, *Vallis Aurea*. Albon had ultimately become a monk in a monastery at Orleans, after having built a church at Fleury, and provided for the conversion of the villa itself into a religious house. It was colonized by Benedictine monks.<sup>4</sup> To its many other titles to celebrity it adds the not altogether unambiguous claim to the possession—at least to having possessed—the body of St. Benedict himself. It is said that the third Abbot of Fleury, St. Mommolin, sent one of his monks into Italy, where the monastery of Monte Cassino was then in ruins, having been pillaged and destroyed by the Lombards, with the commission to steal away the relics of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica from

<sup>3</sup> The Abbé Pardiac.

<sup>4</sup> The church, which is all that now remains of the great abbey, is now in the possession of the Benedictine congregation called *de la Pierre qui vive*, founded about a quarter of a century ago by Père Muard. It appears to be now a parish church.

the grave where they lay in the profaned church. The monk is said to have succeeded—the body of St. Scholastica was given to some religious of the monastery of Mans who had accompanied the monk from Fleury, while Fleury itself retained the relics of the great patriarch himself. This translation, we need hardly say, is disputed by the monks of Monte Cassino itself, and it is to the last-named place that pilgrims to the shrine of St. Benedict have for centuries been in the habit of repairing. The well known author of *Les Monastères Benedictins de l'Italie*, himself a Frenchman, seems to think that the mission from Fleury in the seventh century cannot be entirely apocryphal, but that it is probable that a part of the relics only were taken away.

Fleury, then, had already passed through some centuries of existence, when this monastery, where in riper years he was to rule as a Superior, was the scene of Abbo's first presentation to God's service. The city of Orleans, round which are twined so many historical memories, is supposed to have been his birthplace. His parents were of free but not noble descent, and they trained him with a diligence worthy of his future career. It is probable that Abbo was the only son of Lætus and his wife Ermengarde, and we shall thus be prepared to estimate at its due value their sacrifice in consecrating him to the religious life. We are accustomed, with some reason, to shrink from the idea of a life immolated to God, before there can have been any experience of the prospects that have been sacrificed, but we may at least avoid being scandalized at this practice when we consider how in those days a holy life was not easily reconciled with the strife and turmoil of the world. Parents who viewed with horror the allurements of power, or the common inducements to sin, felt that true affection for their children consisted in withholding them even from the occasions of it. It was then taken for granted that the service of our Lord entailed a life of prayer and penance. It could easily be proved that monastic life was the most favourable to this end. Parents might well consider that there was merit in securing their children from those temptations which were almost inseparable from a secular life, nor could it be deemed an infringement of their liberty, since they were already bound as Christians to renounce the world, and to devote them to religion was only to afford them a more secure refuge from it.

In accordance, then, with the spirit of their age, Lætus and Ermengarde prepared to consecrate their only child to God's service, in the Order of St. Benedict. Abbo was scarcely fourteen years old when his parents conducted him to the chapel belonging to the Monastery of Fleury. There they prostrated themselves before the great altar, imploring grace to consummate their sacrifice. The father rose, placed an act of donation, with an offering for the monastery, in his child's hand, and then proceeded to wrap the boy's right hand in the altar cloth, while in a resolute though broken voice he pronounced the usual form of dedication.

It was Abbo's good fortune to be placed under the wise and tender guidance of Vuilfalde, who at once clothed him in the religious habit. In his early childhood Vuilfalde had blessed him with a prophetic augury for good, from the name Abbo, which by changing a letter he construed "Father," exhorting him to a life worthy of Him from Whom all paternity proceeds. The young disciple was now committed to his care, that he might himself watch over the fulfilment of his pious prediction. Destined to immortalize his name by sanctity and by saintly lore, Abbo applied himself with good will to monastic observance, as well as to the study of literature. His keen intelligence enabled him to retain instructions that he had heard but once, but his love of learning was in subjection to his fervour in devotion and virtue. He was looked upon as an angel of innocence and simplicity, in spite of his rare abilities.

About the year 964, Vuilfalde was appointed Bishop of Chartres, and Richard, prior of Pressy, became Abbot of Fleury. A lover both of study and of students, he so highly appreciated Abbo as to place in his hands the management of the school attached to the monastery. This post he filled with the most enthusiastic approbation of all. This reflects on him no trifling credit. Fleury was then esteemed the centre of learning, as well as the very capital of the fine arts. Abbo's disciples were foremost among the lights of the age. His zeal for study was so ardent, it could not fail to enkindle those who fell under his influence. Moreover, he had all the qualities which combine to attract and guide others. Baillet tells us that "he spoke better than any in his age, he also wrote the best; those of his works which are spared to us, though few in number, force us to admire



the purity and elegance of his style, the wisdom of his thoughts and the extent of his learning." In several monasteries there were two schools, one in the interior for those destined to religion, one outside for the benefit of seculars. This plan was pursued at Fleury, and some idea of Abbo's popularity may be formed when we find that the number of scholars gathered round him amounted to five thousand. This large number has aroused the suspicion of more than one critic, but the balance of authority seems to incline decidedly in favour of the truth of the statement. But take it at its lowest possible interpretation, by supposing that, as Abbo taught for nearly twenty years, the whole number of his scholars during that time is represented by the five thousand, and we still have him, as the master of several hundreds at a time, inasmuch as the course of study would in each case last for at least two or three years. According to this modest calculation the school of Fleury must always have been more populous than the only very large College in any English University—Trinity College, Cambridge, and ten or twelve times as populous as the average of English Colleges. If we are to suppose that Abbo had five thousand scholars under him at once, his pupils must have been more numerous than the undergraduates of all the Universities in the Three Kingdoms put together. This is hardly like what we might expect in an age in which all activity, mental or corporal, was absolutely paralyzed by the continual presence of the gloomy fear of the approaching Judgment!

If people who are living under the immediate influence of the terrible apprehensions which are attributed to the men of the tenth century, are scarcely likely to find much heart for quiet and industrious study, we may surely assert with equal certainty that they would hardly trouble themselves to form libraries. It is said that comparatively few men have sufficient consideration for those who are to come after them to plant trees and forests in the shade of which they can themselves have no hope to sit, and yet it requires a still more definite looking forward to a future, in which we can ourselves have no share, to found a great library. The men of the tenth century, moreover, had solid excuses for the neglect of this thoughtful provision, in the very great danger to which the fruit of their labours was exposed when they had once secured it. The ravages of barbarians, civil wars, and the unsettled

state of various kingdoms, not only checked the progress of learning, they swept away innumerable traces of past erudition. The Normans, on one hand, continued their depredations in spite of concessions, while, on the other, the Hungarians, a ferocious, uncivilized race, had brought devastation into France, especially plundering churches and monasteries. Precious manuscripts were used to light their signal fires, or scattered as litter in the stables; rolls of parchment were turned to account in making shields. No wonder the proofs of intellectual vigour in the tenth century are less frequent than might be expected. If on the one side we see men groping their way amid difficulties to clearer light and more accurate knowledge, if we find them making strides that surprise us when we consider the scanty means within their grasp, on the other side we perceive a horde of ruthless barbarians stamping out time after time the fruit of their patient labours.

Abbo, however, was on the alert to find a remedy. He insisted that each scholar should present two manuscripts to the monastery every year.<sup>5</sup> Thus he laid the foundation of that library of Fleury which has been so celebrated in bibliographical history. Still it was of gradual growth. It was a seed time of which he could not reap the harvest. His own studies were necessarily assisted by no definite system, as well as but a scant collection of books. It required a clear judgment to preserve him from erroneous conclusions. He created no new system, but excelled in the exposition of those questions which he had already grasped. Many of his disciples have found a place in history, but to one we are particularly indebted, since, in addition to other literary efforts, he has left a *Life* of his friend and guide. Aimoin not only learnt in the school of Abbo, he also enjoyed his confidence, and was present at his martyrdom.

The popularity evidenced by his numerous pupils did not dazzle Abbo. He was conscious of shortcomings in his own acquirements. The desire to give a more vigorous impetus to learning impelled him to pursue studies to which he had also a strong attraction, but for this purpose his professorship must

<sup>5</sup> If this requirement was really put in force, the fact would seem to show that the number of Abbo's scholars must be taken at the lower computation suggested above. Ten thousand manuscripts—unless they were the merest trifles—would of themselves form a large library, but ten thousand a year would have been an impossibility.

be abandoned, and he must once more become a pupil. Accordingly, he seems first to have sought the school of Paris founded by Remigius, where he studied arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. Hence he is supposed to have journeyed to all the most celebrated seats of learning in France, though Rheims is the only one distinctly named by his biographer. At this period the great Gerbert was instructing the crowds who flocked around him. Abbo was thus brought in contact with one whose name stands but a little before his own in the march of intellectual progress. Having gleaned somewhat from each system, Abbo was also instructed in music at Orleans, but there remained still the principles of rhetoric and geometry, which none had expounded to him. These he had to grapple with alone, and conquer by his own industry and penetration. His success is the more creditable to him and to the mental vigour of the century which he adorned. His application to science bore plentiful fruit in his writings. Amongst other subjects, his devotion to the Church led him to take up the intricate question as to the observation of Easter. This has so long been settled for us, that his labours are now chiefly interesting as indicating the progress of astronomy in the tenth century. The majority of his works have, unfortunately, not been saved to posterity; the titles alone have been handed down to us, but it is clear that he excelled in the study of philosophy and mathematics as well as of astronomy. Here, again, we fail to discern that paralyzing alarm as to the approach of the end of the world of which so much has been made by writers who are desirous of utterly condemning the men of the tenth century. It is quite clear that Abbo studied and wrote very much as if he had no more fear about the imminence of the day of doom than his critics themselves, and it is not risking a very hazardous conjecture to suppose that he was not singular in his generation in these respects. People who write books imply people who read them—or, at all events, who may be supposed to read them, and yet it must be a very fascinating literature indeed that can find favour in the eyes of men in that state of stupid consternation which has been ascribed to the men of this period.

We next find Abbo sent for a time to England. St. Oswald, who became Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards Archbishop of York, had in 960 repaired to Fleury with some other prelates, in order to be, instructed in the religious life. The illness of

his uncle, St. Odo, soon led to his recall, but doubtless he had imbibed a deep affection for Fleury, since, when in 974 he founded a monastery at Ramsey in Huntingdonshire, on what was then an islet in the midst of a marsh, he soon begged that it might be placed under the government of a monk and a scholastic from Fleury. Germain accepted the Abbacy of Ramsey, while Abbo, then only in deacon's orders, consented to sacrifice his love of country, as well as the tranquillity of conventual observance, for the more missionary character of life to which he was invited in conducting the school of Ramsey. Perhaps in these days we do not readily appreciate the heroism involved in this distant journey. The route chosen led the travellers through a rough, uncivilized people called the Morini, to Calais, whence they were to embark, as the sea passage was narrowest there.

The story of this voyage shows us how times are changed since the tenth century. If it had been to New Zealand instead of England, it could not have seemed more alarming. Our Saint, after tearing himself from his beloved seclusion, and from the fatherly tenderness of his Abbot Oylbold, found himself confronted by the terrors of the sea, aggravated by tempestuous and unfavourable winds. A whole month was passed in vain watching for an interlude of calm. At last Abbo, consumed with a longing to devote himself to the work to which he is called by God, appealed to the pilot whether he could not venture on the sea. "No," replied the pilot, "but the change of wind leads me to hope that in a few days we may have a safe voyage." The Saint exclaimed, "If by the merits of our most holy father, St. Benedict, it pleases our Lord that for the good of my neighbour I should cross the sea, the calmness of the waves shall be a sign to me at daybreak. But should heaven reveal a contrary will by a continuance of the storm, I shall return once more to Fleury." After this he repaired to the inn, where he entreated one of the monks who escorted him to join him in supplication for a blessing on his enterprize. They both prostrated themselves, and after uniting in prayer they quietly retired to rest. At the dawn of day a message from the pilot reached them, announcing that they might safely set sail, and Abbo, full of joyful confidence, embarked in a vessel, one of a fleet of nine. At first there was every appearance of fine weather and a speedy arrival at their destination. But the sky soon

darkened, the wind rose, while amid the flashes of lightning and the roar of the thunder, while the monsters of the deep added to the fears of the trembling sailors, face to face with death, amid cries and lamentations, Abbo, like another St. Paul, remained alone brave and self-possessed. Out of nine vessels that started, three only reached their port in safety, one of which contained St. Abbo. A signal miracle had saved his life, and he who was so specially indebted to Divine Providence was in his turn to protect others. He became one of the most popular patrons of distressed mariners.

The uncultivated neighbourhood of Ramsey, which was a new monastery, must have afforded a painful contrast to Fleury, and Abbo's description of it in his verses as a vast marsh, only proves how greatly England was indebted to the monks for fertilizing the soil. These verses, by the bye, may just as well be inserted here, both as a specimen of the Latin versification of the tenth century, and of the remarkable elasticity of mind and spirit which enabled Abbo—weighed down and stupefied, as the writers already mentioned would have us believe, by the approaching terrors of the Day of Judgment, as well as by his sense of exile from what had been the home of his life since childhood—to write so calmly, and even, we think, somewhat jauntily, about the fish and eels and constellations, Hercules, Bootes, and the polestar, in a way that, in the nineteenth century, would show a state of mind altogether free from such awful apprehensions. Here are the verses, as given by Mabillon in his *Annales Ordinis Benedictini*. We wonder whether M. Michelet could produce a much better set?

O Ramiseya cohors, amplis quæ claudere stagnis,  
Purior obrizo niteris esse Deo.  
Vasta palus, piscosa nimis, sua dyndima pandit,  
Ut nova sint eremi claustra reperta tibi.  
Nam qua cerviferæ consurgit proditor Hydræ,  
Insula silvoso gurgite pulcra nitet.  
Et qua splendentis se mergunt lora Bootis,  
Pons est inde suis pervius Angligenis.  
Qua Cynosura poli fixum regit undequæ gyrum,  
Anguilliosa palus nescit habere modum.  
Unde refert umbras vaga lux Phæbæa sinistras,  
Terra patet, nullo continuata vado.  
Huc me forte dedi ignotis ignotus alumnis,  
Quos, Benedicte pater, jure tuere paras.

We must leave to the present inhabitants of Ramsey the task of recognizing the various local notes here given.

Numerous pupils raised themselves under the instruction of the learned foreigner. The most celebrated of these was Britfrithus, who wrote a commentary on Bede's works, but whose principal undertaking was the Life of St. Dunstan. This life is inserted by the Bollandists for the 19th May, and at that time must have been of great value. The devotion to St. Dunstan was afterwards so widely spread, that even to this day he is honoured in forty-eight churches. Neither was Abbo's own pen idle, for while at Ramsey he accomplished a work entitled *Grammatical Questions*. It evinces much perspicacity and classical knowledge, as well as acquaintance with the Greek language. In his remarks upon the *Te Deum*, Abbo propounds the view that it was the composition of St. Hilary of Poitiers, referring to this as an unquestioned fact.<sup>6</sup> Abbo's teaching in England won him much applause and respect. King Ethelred the Second, showed him much kindness, while St. Oswald, Archbishop of York, and St. Dunstan, the Archbishop of Canterbury (whose life his disciple wrote later), gave him every proof of friendship. He did not confine himself to the increase of learning at Ramsey, but founded schools in various other monasteries, particularly at York, Bury St. Edmunds, at Canterbury, and at Cambridge.

From the seventh to the eleventh century, may be counted twenty-three kings and sixty queens of Anglo-Saxon race who have been recognized by the Church as saints. No other nation has been honoured in an equal degree, but the King most venerated in England during the tenth century was St. Edmund, who about a hundred years previously had suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Danes. Still, there existed as yet no biography of him, and St. Dunstan prevailed upon Abbo to undertake it. This he did with such hearty

<sup>6</sup> The conjectures, for they are hardly more, as to the authorship of the *Te Deum*, will be found summarily collected in the *Histoire de St. Abbon*, by M. Pardiac, which we are following. St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, or again both these saints together, St. Abundius of Como (fifth century), St. Nicetus of Treves (sixth century), and St. Hilary of Arles, predecessor of St. Cesarius, who prescribes the *Te Deum* in his rule, have been mentioned as the author or authors. It is thought that the last eight verses have been added since the original composition, and that the hymn ended at first with "æternâ fac cum sanctis tuis in gloria numerari." These last verses contain expressions which seem to point to a monastic origin. "Per singulos dies benedicimus te," &c. Abbo wrote his work on the *Te Deum* to correct a false reading which had crept in—"Tu ad liberandum suscepisti hominem." It is useless to conjecture on what grounds he made his positive statement that Hilary of Poitiers was the author, unless we suppose that he merely repeated a tradition about St. Hilary of Arles, and quoted the name of the see wrongly by mistake. The present Bishop of Angoulême (Mgr. Cousseau), has written a paper in which he endeavours to prove by internal evidence that the hymn belongs to the more famous St. Hilary, as Abbo says.



goodwill that it may be looked upon as one of his principal works.<sup>7</sup>

Abbo's sojourn in England is supposed to have lasted about two years, during which time he received priest's orders from the hands of St. Oswald, who naturally wished to secure him for his own diocese, but St. Dunstan was equally attached to our saint. The amiable discussion between the two prelates was, however, terminated by his Superior, the Abbot of Fleury, who deemed it was time that so much virtue should be allowed to flourish on its native soil, whither accordingly Abbo returned towards the end of the year 988. He returned, only indeed to resume the duties of a humble religious, but he was not destined to enjoy his obscurity long, since the death of Oylbold in the same year, led to his being elected Abbot. For a brief space, his authority was negatived by the intrigue of an ambitious monk, who, under the protection of Hugh Capet and his son Robert, managed to usurp the office of Superior. This obstacle was soon removed by the death of the false Abbot, and Abbo fitted himself for the responsibilities of his position by a profound study of Holy Scripture as well as of the Fathers. Unfortunately history gives but slender information as to his exercise of his prerogative. We get a glimpse here and there, proving it to have been wise as well as just.

Abbo's appointment as Abbot of Fleury very naturally breaks his life into two parts. We have hitherto considered the more simply monastic period of his career, and we have certainly found as yet but few indications of that state of abject paralysis which has been supposed to characterize the men of his time. We shall see in a second paper whether the more externally active period which has yet to be told can be considered as more favourable to this ingenious hypothesis.

<sup>7</sup> M. Pardiac may already have astonished some of his readers by his statement about the translation of the relics of St. Benedict to Fleury, but the claim of Fleury to possess them is old and well known. What are we to say of the assertion that Louis the Eighth of France, "after his unfortunate war in England," brought the body of St. Edmund to France, and made a present of it to the city of Toulouse? We cannot help wondering whether the numberless princes and nobles, bishops, and devout Christians of every grade, who visited St. Edmondsbury during the centuries between the dates of Louis the Eighth and the Reformation, had any idea that the body of the royal saint was not in its famous shrine. However, M. Pardiac gives an account of the magnificent *chasse* in which it was kept at Toulouse (until the Revolution), and of a solemn elevation of the body in the seventeenth century, when it was carried in procession and venerated during eight days, to obtain the deliverance of the town from an epidemic. He tells us that the entire body is still at Toulouse, excepting particles which have been given to other churches. Probably Louis the Eighth took away *some* relics, which by being placed in a *chasse* capable of containing a whole body, gave the idea that the whole body was there. This is the account to be given of the several "heads" of various saints, which are venerated in different places; the reliquary is in the shape of the head, and so is supposed to contain the whole head. Thus we hope that Catholic England may some day recover the relics of St. Edmund.

## On Analogy.

---

As M. Jourdain had been expressing his thoughts in prose for some fifty years without ever having realized the fact, so I think that it may be said that we are all of us in the constant habit of using analogical words without being at all conscious that we are doing so. We rarely utter a sentence without introducing some expression which bears an analogical meaning; nay, more, a large proportion of the nouns in the English language, and indeed in any other, are in a strict and proper sense analogical: in fact it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that there is no word that can wholly escape from this all-pervading analogy, for who can say that the word which we utter conveys our exact meaning to the mind of our listener, and that there is not at least some delicate shade of difference between his acceptance of it and our own—some faint, subtle, minute, but at the same time real analogy, which causes him to misunderstand, or, at all events, not fully to appreciate our meaning?

And, as a matter of fact, half the controversies which have torn the world asunder—political, moral, religious—have arisen from this source. The war which raged so fiercely began without a definition of the terms employed; or, if they were defined, in the very words of the definition there was some lurking analogy which rendered it practically useless. The struggle was based on a misunderstanding from the very first, but it has been none the less fatal in its consequences on this account. The very fall of man may be said to be based on an analogy. *Eritis sicut Dei* was true in one sense but not in another; every heresy which has prevailed, every rebellion which has torn the Church asunder, is connected in some way with an analogical use of terms. If it were not for analogy no Protestant could venture to repeat the Creed, or profess himself a member of the Catholic Church.

It needs therefore no apology if in the present article I propose to deal with this question of analogy. It is one which meets us at the very outset of our logic; if it is dismissed in a

few short sentences in our ordinary text-books, it is not because it is unimportant, but because in the present day the growth of physical science has turned the attention of men rather to facts than to words; our struggle with the Positivist school turns rather on the accuracy of certain alleged facts, and on the consequences which follow from them, than on any difference in the use of words. But at the same time, for this very reason it is of the gravest moment that we, the metaphysical school, should be most accurate and guarded in the expressions we employ; for our opponents are not satisfied with bringing forward their own inductive conclusions to resist our *à priori* doctrines, but they attack those very doctrines themselves as not only pure assumptions, but also as untrue, and even as self-contradictory. Now if this attack arises from the fact that they quote our words indeed, but overlook their proper and accurate meaning, it follows that we should weigh each word with the utmost care in order to guard, as far as possible, against the danger of being misunderstood. One instance before proceeding to my subject. *Realism* is, I believe, one of the principal sources of prejudice on the part of educated Protestants against the scholastic philosophy, and as described in all the Protestant text-books it is indeed an utterly untenable doctrine; but when we come to look into the question, we find that the hypothesis which they attach is not the true Realistic doctrine of all the mediæval scholastics, but that which is known to us by the name of ultra-Realism. They first attribute us a theory which we utterly disclaim, and then proceed to demolish our system with the most complete effrontery and the most triumphant success.

I must make one other remark in passing. We should imagine at first sight that a knowledge of different languages would to a great degree diminish, if it did not altogether obviate, the danger of being misled by an analogical use of words. To a certain extent this is the case; the habit of reflection on the different meanings of the same word often enables the cultivated disputant to detect a fallacy where it would be hid from one who knew no language but his own; it is one of the most valuable results of the study of languages, and especially of those very different from our own, that it imparts a versatility and a correctness in the use of words which cannot be gained in any other way; it compels a close attention to the most delicate shades in the meaning of the same word. This is an advantage

which especially attaches to Latin verse. It is impossible not to recognize the analogical use of the word "sea," when we find that it may be rendered in Latin, always with some difference of meaning, by *mare*, *pontus*, *pelagus*, *petum*, *vadum*, *Neptunus*, *oceanus*, *Thetis*, *altum*, *profundum*, *marmor*, *æquor*, and perhaps some half-dozen expressions more. But at the same time, a knowledge of various languages is not such a safeguard as we might imagine, for it is a most unfortunate fact that the analogical use of a word very often runs through a number of different languages, especially where the variation in the meaning is not a very obvious one, and therefore is more likely to deceive; and besides, a word imported from a foreign language sometimes enables a man to clothe a fallacy, where the more homely expressions of his mother tongue would lay bare the deception he imposes on his hearers or on himself by a word which either he or they do not thoroughly understand. Technical words are, as we know, generally foreign either in their form or their derivation, and technical words are, above all others, a constant and a prolific source of error.

But we have not yet defined our subject. What is analogy? All words are either *univocal* or *equivocal*. A word is called univocal when it always expresses the same concept, applied in the same way to all the individuals of which it can be predicated. On the other hand, a word is called *æquivocal* when it expresses either concepts altogether different, or concepts in some respects the same, but yet applicable to different objects after a different manner. In the former case the concept is strictly and properly equivocal, in the latter it is analogical. And here we must notice that it is very hard to draw a line between these two classes of words. Some words indeed are not in any sense analogical, and their different meanings are in no way connected, *e.g.*, ounce, pound, page, case, bull; but there is a large class of words about which it is difficult to decide whether they are analogical or not. When we use the word *club* in its material or its social signification, it at first seems as if there was no common meaning, but if we look a little more closely into the ambiguous word we shall find in its different senses the common idea of *union* and *strength*. We should at first imagine that the word *tract* was purely equivocal, as meaning a *pamphlet* or a *space of country*, but there is contained in both the notion of extension, of something spread out over a certain surface. And so the merry *mill* which our sporting papers describe derives its name from

the process of beating and pounding common to the faces of those engaged in it and to the corn which is ground into flour. Indeed, there are few words in any language wholly and purely equivocal. Some writers on logic have found themselves so perplexed in the distinction between these words which have something in common, and others which are more strictly analogical, that they have divided equivocal words into those in which the equivocation is purely accidental, and those in which it springs from a common derivation or indicates some kind of accidental connection. The words which we have just mentioned would obviously come under this latter class.

But we are now concerned with analogy in its strict and proper sense, where the concept is in some respects the same, but is applied to different objects in a different manner. In our very definition an analogy at once presents itself. In what sense are we using the word *concept*? Are we speaking of the *formal* or of the *objective* concept? Is the analogy to be looked for in the notion which exists within the mind, or in the object outside of us, which we regard under a certain aspect? In order to answer these questions we must say a few words on the difference between the formal and the objective concept.

Every term which we employ may be said to stand for three different things. Primarily and immediately it stands for a certain idea or concept existing in our mind, originally derived from external things, directly or indirectly, through the medium of the senses, but at present purely subjective in that it forms part of our intelligence, and so is cut off from the world outside us. This is the *subjective*, or *formal* concept; it is an individual thing, a quality inhering in the mind, but yet an image or representation of something without us.

In a secondary and mediate sense the term stands for some object or quality, or set of qualities, existing outside the mind, but presented to the intellect under a certain aspect, which aspect is represented in the formal concept. This external object so regarded is called the *objective* concept. It may be some concrete thing, or an universal idea, or even an imaginary set of qualities which have not any actual existence, but which the mind chooses to invest with a factitious being in order to transfer them into herself under the guise of a formal concept. The objective concept is a concept only in an analogical sense, in that it forms the material out of which the formal concept is derived.

And lastly, the terms we use stand in a more remote sense for external objects, as they are in themselves apart from the mind which contemplates them, and from the special aspect under which they are regarded. We have now to decide whether we are to look for our analogy to the objects in themselves, or to the objects as regarded by us, that is, to their objective concepts, or to the concepts existing in our minds, and by which they are represented ; that is, to their formal concepts.

Certainly not to the objects in themselves only ; else every general term which we use would be analogical. For when we speak of *men*, and apply the term to a number of different individuals, we indeed regard the quality of humanity as precisely identical in all of them, but yet in itself, apart from the mind which contemplates it, this identity does not exist. The humanity of Peter is not the same in itself as the humanity of Paul ; it is alike in that they are both copies of the prototypal idea existing in the divine intelligence, but yet it is not strictly identical. It is individuated in each of them, and individuation is incompatible with identity. And the same is true of every common term, and therefore, if we look to things in themselves, and regard the terms we use as expressing their objective nature, every such term would be analogical.

Next in turn we will take the formal concept. As we have said that words represent primarily and immediately our formal concepts, it follows that to constitute a word strictly and properly analogical, the formal concept must be in some respects the same, while at the same time it is applied to its various objects in a different manner. When we speak of bodily and mental sensation, and apply the same word *feeling* to each, the picture which is present to our minds must have three essential characteristics. (1) A perfect identity in some essential particular. In this respect it is one picture, and not many. We withdraw our attention from the various points of difference which suggest themselves when we turn our thoughts to the different sensations of body and mind, and fix it only on what is common to both—viz., a certain impression, either pleasurable or painful, which is derived from without. (2) There must be not only this one picture or image present to the mind, but two different pictures, differing essentially from one another. In this case we turn our thoughts to the second aspect of the analogical concept—viz., its variety. In these two pictures we neglect, for the time being, what is common to each, and allow



our attention to rest only on the distinction between them, which consists in this, that the one kind of feeling affects the body, the other the mind; that the one is sometimes physical and material, the other something superphysical and immaterial. (3) But there is a third requisite before we can pronounce our formal concept to be strictly analogical, and that is, that of the two different images present to our mind, the one must be primary, the other secondary. The one must be original, the other derived from it. The one must be based on the proper meaning of the word, the other on some further and less strict signification. In the instance given above, it is evident that the concept which corresponds primarily to that of the word feeling, is that which relates to the body, and is applied only in a secondary sense to the mind. It is true that it is difficult in some cases to decide which is the original picture that the analogical word calls up, and which the devised one; but yet the distinction always exists; the history of the word, or its derivation, or the more ordinary sense in which it is used, will enable us to decide the question. This distinction is of the greatest importance, because it is this which enables us to distinguish between analogical and generic words. When we say that men, and animals, and plants, all *live*, the word *life* may be regarded as suggesting either one picture or concept, containing what is common to all living creatures, or three several pictures, according as the life we contemplate is intellectual, or sensitive, or vegetative, and therefore it may be said to fulfil the two first of the essential characteristics of an analogical concept; but it fails in the third, it is not applicable primarily to one of the classes of living things, and secondarily to others. We cannot say, *e.g.*, that *life* belongs to man in its primary meaning, to animals and plants only in a secondary sense. But when, on the other hand, we speak of a hard stone and a hard heart, of the cruel sea and a cruel tyrant, it is obvious that the physical concept in the one case, and the moral in the other, is the prominent and original notion which the words respectively convey.

We see, then, what is required in the formal concept to constitute the word which represents it a strictly analogical word, and we must pass on to the objective concept. Must we have these same characteristics in the object as it is represented to our minds as well as in our mental representation of it? We have said that all that is true of the formal concept is not

necessarily true of the objective concept. The latter is only a *concept* by courtesy. It may be universal, while the formal concept is necessarily individual; it may have no real existence in itself, while the formal concept must really exist. But these points of difference concern the objective concept *in itself*, and not in so far as it contains certain qualities which are represented to the mind in the formal concept. In respect of these latter, and it is these with which analogy is concerned, whatever is true of the one is necessarily true of the other. For we must remember that the objective concept is not the object viewed in itself, but the object as it is regarded by us. Whatever is contained in the formal concept is not necessarily contained in the object itself, but whatever is contained in the formal concept is necessarily contained in the object as represented to our mind in the objective concept. We may illustrate this by a case which furnishes an exact parallel. In a photographic picture there is often contained a great deal which is not to be found in the object represented, but at the same time, there is nothing whatever contained in the photograph which is not contained in the object when regarded strictly under that aspect which the picture represents.

Our conclusion therefore is, that the analogy of the word must be reproduced in the formal and also in the objective concept of the thing which the word expresses. Must it also be reproduced in the thing itself, viewed in itself? If we separate off the object of which we form an idea from the idea which we form of it, must we find in the object thus separated off an analogy corresponding to the analogy of the word; or to speak more strictly, in the various subjects (since they are more than one) for which the analogical word stands, must there be contained some one common internal characteristic existing in all of them regarded in themselves, and apart from their relation to the mind which contemplates them?

The answer to this question requires an explanation of the two kinds of analogy. Analogy, in its ordinary sense, is either founded on a similarity between two or more objects, or upon a dependence of one or several on some subject from which they derive their name in virtue of that dependence. The first of these is what is familiar to us under the name of the analogy of *proportion*, the second is the analogy of *attribution*. In the first there is a kind of family likeness between the various analogates. In the second, there is no likeness, but a connection

in the way of cause and effect, or sign and thing signified. The analogy of proportion is the foundation of all metaphorical expressions. The analogy of attribution of the grammatical figure which is familiar to us as *metonymy*, in which an epithet is transferred from its proper object to some other by reason of some sort of dependence of the one object on the other. We have an instance of the analogy of proportion in the word *unhealthy* as applied to the *mind* and to the *body*; of the analogy of attribution in the word *unhealthy* as applied to *food* and to the *body which is fed*, where the name is applied to food only as the cause of unhealthiness in the body which receives it.

Now if it is necessary to analogy that in the objects viewed objectively there should be one common nature found in each, though found in each in a different way, we shall find that, judged by this test, the analogy of proportion holds its ground, but the analogy of attribution does not strictly fill the required condition.

For referring back to our definition of analogy, we find that a word is analogical when the concept which it expresses is in some respects the same, but yet belongs to different objects in a different way. Now if this definition is a correct one, only such terms can be called *properly* and *strictly* analogical which express some essential characteristic found in the objects themselves regarded in themselves, and not merely under a certain aspect which we choose to put before our minds. In other words, we must not only have the same objective concept, but also some objective reality corresponding to it. It is not enough that our mind should frame the common basis of the analogy, but it must also have a foundation in the things themselves considered apart from our intelligence. In the analogy of proportion such a foundation always exists; when we speak of a hard stone and a hard heart, we have in the objects themselves the common qualities, unyielding, unbending, on which no impression can be made. But in the analogy of attribution this foundation does not exist, at least, as consisting of qualities common to each analogate. Thus, what is there in common between a healthy body and healthy food? At the most it can be said that the one possesses health, and the other produces it, but this external relation is no common inherent quality, and therefore does not satisfy our definition.

It is true that the scholastics generally used the word analogy in the wider sense, and apply it to all those words corresponding to which there are different objects related in some way to each

other, whether that relation consist in the possession of some common qualities, or in the mere external relation of some kind of dependence. This use of the word is sanctioned by long usage, and the necessity of some convenient term, but yet it is a departure none the less from its strict and proper meaning, and this for the following reasons—

1. The very word itself signifies *proportion*, and therefore to divide it off into a proportionate proportion, and a proportion of attribution is, to say the least, a very complete setting aside of the original use of the word, which can only be paralleled by the equally anomalous division in logic of hypothetical propositions into conditional hypotheticals on the one hand, and disjunctive hypotheticals on the other.

2. Aristotle does not include under analogy the so-called analogy of attribution. The word "healthy" he brings forward as an instance, not of analogous words, but of those which derive their name from their relation to something else, and limits analogy to such terms as express a proportionate ratio, *i.e.*, to those which can be brought under the mathematical formula,  $a:b::c:d$ , and this is true of those words which belong to the analogy of proportion and to none else.

3. In the account which is given by Suarez of the analogy of attribution, he acknowledges that it does not strictly and properly deserve the name of analogy at all; he points out distinctly that in it there is no one concept common to all the analogates, but that the form which is the origin of the name is found only in one of them, and has merely an external relation to the rest, that the very name belongs to the secondary analogates only in an improper and metaphorical sense, and that, lastly, these secondary analogates depend upon the first for their definition, and must necessarily include it.

When, therefore, we allow the name of analogy to the so-called analogy of attribution, it is only under protest, and by courtesy, in an inferior and metaphorical sense. Words which are in this way analogical might perhaps more correctly be termed *equivoca consilio*, reserving the name of *analogia* to the analogy of proportion; such words would be *equivoca* in that the objects which they represent have no common nature expressed by the name, they would be *equivoca consilio* inasmuch as it is not by chance that they have one common name, but because of a certain relation between the objects which gives rise to this common name.

It may be urged that this is a mere verbal question, and therefore one of small importance, that it can make little difference whether we define analogy so as to include the analogy of attribution, or whether we give it the name reluctantly and under protest, or whether we refuse altogether to acknowledge it as an analogy. This objection we have already met; a strict and exact meaning of words is all important if we are to be correct and exact in our thoughts. Our very faith may be endangered by an ignorance of what analogy really means. When Dr. Mansel tells us that God is good, merciful, just, not in the common sense in which we use the words, but that on the one side or the other these terms are used in an analogical sense; the adversary, with his vague and undefined notion of what sort of an analogy it is, declares that such a God he cannot and will not obey. To use the very word analogy itself in an analogical sense is at least a little confusing, at all events it is important that we should be aware that these different kinds of analogy exist, and should be conscious of the difference between them.

To sum up the conclusions at which we have hitherto arrived. To a strict analogy, in the original and primary meaning of the word, it is required not only that there should be in the concepts formal and objective, which the word expresses, some common note or notes, but also that in the object of the concept, objectively considered, there should be contained some common quality or qualities in one and the same manner; and this is only the case with the analogy of proportion.

To analogy, in the wider and secondary meaning of the word, it is required that as in the former case there should be in the concepts some common characteristic, but it is not required that in the objects considered in themselves there should be some corresponding intrinsic quality, but only that there should be such a connection between the objects that some quality in the one is related in the way of dependence on some quality in the other, and this is the case with the analogy of attribution.

We have now prepared the way for the very difficult and much disputed question respecting the analogy of "Being." When we predicate being of God and of His creatures of substance and of accident, do we use the word "being" in an univocal or an analogical sense, and if the latter, under what kind of analogy is it to be placed?

We have already remarked that an univocal word must not only express some one common attribute or set of attributes, but also that these should be found in the various objects *in the same way*. It is in this latter point that "being" fails to be univocal. We have indeed one concept which, when considered apart from its manner in the various individuals, is one and the same. We can contemplate *being* in itself without reference to this or that kind of being; we can place it before our minds in such a way that the differences between one and another kind of being are not formally present to us; it exhibits all its various objects under one and the same aspect. The word itself, which expresses the concept, has in itself one meaning, and therefore we have one concept of being. But this is not enough to constitute the word univocal, because it lacks the further conditions, that it should be found in the various individuals in one and the same manner. Although we may formally exclude from our minds the consideration of the various modes of being, yet we cannot really banish them from our thoughts. For all other universals are contained in their various objects in exactly the same way. *Humanity*, as humanity, is contained in Peter in the same way as it is contained in Paul. And therefore we can abstract from all the differences between Peter and Paul, and regard them, in respect of their humanity, as *one* and *the same*. But *being*, as *being*, is not contained in substance in the same way as it is contained in accident, and therefore we cannot abstract for all the differences between substance and accident, and regard them in respect of their being as one and the same. In other words, "*being*" as a concept, considered in itself, is *one*. Here it resembles all other universals. But "*being*," considered in its application to subordinate concepts, at once changes its character, and as it enters into each it loses its unity; or rather, it appears in each under a different aspect by reason of the different manner in which it inheres in each. This is sometimes expressed by saying that when we regard a number of beings in a vague and indeterminate way as distinguished from things which have no being, we apply the notion of being to all in the same sense, but when we look closely into them one by one, our concept of being, which at first sight appeared to be one and the same, begins to assume a different form in each. The reason of this is that in the first case we did not formally consider the differences between their various modes of being, but in the second, on a stricter



examination, these differences presented themselves to us as real, actual, essential differences, which cling to "*being*" in spite of every effort which the mind makes to shake them off. They were there in latent form even from the first, and this is what we mean by saying that we can never strictly abstract from the differences of being. We did not at first notice them, and this is what we mean by saying that we can exclude from our mind the formal consideration of these various differences.

"*Being*," therefore, is an analogical word, but in what sense does it fall naturally under the analogy of proportion? or are we to look for it in the analogy of attribution? or is it only an anomalous kind of universal, which does not properly belong to either kind of analogy?

First of all, "*being*" is usually assigned to the analogy of attribution, inasmuch as all being is either dependent or independent, and dependent being has its being only in virtue of its dependence. That is, the word is analogical by reason of a connection in the way of dependence of one of the analogates on the other. But here a difficulty arises. In all other instances of the analogy of attribution, the form on which the analogy depends, the qualities expressed in the name are found intrinsically only in the primary analogate, and extrinsically in the rest. But in "*being*" the form is found alike intrinsically in all, in accident as well as in substance, in creatures as well as in their Creator. For this reason, logicians have been driven to the somewhat clumsy expedient of inventing a new class of the analogy of attribution specially to accommodate "*being*," saying that analogy of attribution is of two kinds—(1) that in which the form is intrinsic in the primary analogate, extrinsic in the rest; (2) that in which it is intrinsic in all. But as no other instance of this second class besides "*being*" exists, it is obviously an unsatisfactory solution of the difficulty.

But it may be asked, Why may we not class "*being*" under the analogy of proportion? If this alone is strict and true analogy, is there not a sort of fitness in supposing that the analogy of being is of this kind? If it is true that the formal concept of being is found alike in substance and accident, in God and in creatures, but is found in them in a different way, does not this satisfy at once the requirements of a true analogy? May we not say that as substance is to its being, so is accident to its being? and therefore is not the analogy necessarily one of proportion? To this we answer that all this is true, and

that therefore we may in some sense place being under the analogy of proportion, but unfortunately it fails in one important requisite to fulfil the requirements which we have given above. For in the analogy of proportion there is always some one object to which the common concept is primarily and strictly applicable, while to all the rest it belongs only in a secondary and transferred sense. But this is not the case with "being." When we speak of the being of creatures as distinguished from the being of God, or of finite as opposed to infinite being, or of the being of accident as opposed to the being of substance, we do not use the word in the one case in its simple and exact sense, and in the other in a secondary and transferred one, but it represents a concept which strictly and properly belongs to creatures as well as to their Creator, to accident as well as to substance, to the finite as well as to the infinite. It is true that in one respect we may trace a difference between the being of God and of creatures, inasmuch as the latter is derived from the former as the effect from the cause; but none the less does it strictly and properly inhere in them, and therefore we must, on the whole, decide that to include being under the analogy of proportion is, if not absolutely incorrect, at least dangerous, and likely to deceive.

But we must not overlook one other alternative, Why should not being be regarded as a higher genus containing under it the lower genera of substance and accident? It may be said that we need not perplex ourselves with this analogical use of being, but may consider it as univocal, divided at once by the differentiae of "self-subsisting," and "inhering in another," into the two subordinate classes of substance and accident. This theory, however, is inadmissible for this reason, that the very differentiae which we use to divide the genus include the very genus itself. It is necessary to an univocal concept that it should not only exist as one and the same in different individuals, but should exist in them in the same way. Life, *e.g.*, is not only the same in men, animals, and plants, but is in each in the same manner. But "being," regarded as one concept, exists in a different manner in substance and accident. "Self-subsisting" and "inhering in another" are at once different modes of being, and so rob being of its unity, when it takes its place in the subordinate genera of which they profess to be the differentiae, and exhibit its analogical character when it realizes itself in them. It is therefore incorrect to say that substance and accident are subordinate genera coming

under being. Substance and accident are *simple* concepts, not because they are not resolvable into two concepts, but because they are not resolvable into two concepts which mutually exclude one another; just in the same way as burning heat is a simple concept because the concept of heat does not exclude the concept of burning, or the concept of burning that of heat. In the same way substance, *i.e.*, being subsisting in itself is a simple concept, because subsisting in itself does not exclude being, and being does not exclude subsisting itself. The true account of substance and accident is that they are merely a more express mode of forming a concept of being, they are the special and determinate modes of "being," which is in itself something confused and indeterminate. This explains why we can never strictly abstract from the differences of being. It is because such abstraction consists in act of knowledge which is in some sense confused and indeterminate, in that it is an act by which we do not draw out of a number of kinds of being one distinct and determinate concept common to all, but merely a similitude or agreement which enters into all the modes of being found in individual things.

Let us now review our conclusions. "*Being*" does not come under the analogy of proportion, because it belongs strictly and as of a right to all the analogates. It does not come under the analogy of attribution, properly so called, because it has an intrinsic relation to all the analogates. It is not merely an all-embracing class, because its subordinate classes can only be divided off by *differentiæ*, which are included in the genus. And at the same time it is each and all of these in an improper and analogical sense. How, then, are we to deal with a concept so perverse and slippery, which is ever evading our grasp, which appears everywhere, and yet refuses each place that we have allotted to it? The ordinary plan is, as we have said, to condemn it to solitary confinement for life, to build a separate class for it, a branch of one of the kinds of analogy specially devoted to its use. But even when we think that we have found for it a suitable home, it still eludes us. For when we have assigned it to the analogy of attribution—we are obliged to explain we are not attempting to include it in the ordinary analogy of attribution, but in the analogy of attribution used in a secondary and analogical sense—we can only classify the ambiguous word in a class which thereby itself acquires a fresh ambiguity. This is perhaps the

best of all the alternatives which present themselves, and its universal adoption by the best of the scholastic logicians proves it to be so; but it is not a very satisfactory expedient after all. The reason of its being so unsatisfactory is to be found in the nature of "*being*" itself.

For "*being*" is the Proteus of metaphysical thought; it assumes a new form for every single mode of being which exists. It is everywhere in us and around us, everywhere it is one, yet everywhere different. Volumes have been written to explain its nature, and the wisest solution of the question at which men have arrived is that it is something in itself vague and confused and indeterminate. If you ask us under what head we are to class it, we answer that it belongs to each and yet to none, to one and yet to all. It is analogical, yet belongs to no analogy; it is one, yet multiform. The tiny child grasps its meaning, the wisest philosopher pronounces it to be indistinct and incomprehensible. It seems so simple, yet it is so mysterious. It is, in fact, a reflection in some sense of the incomprehensible character of God, though at the same time in its mutability and variety it represents the ever-changing, ever-varying character of created things.

R. F. C.

## *Chapters of Contemporary History.*

---

### I.—HOW THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC WAS MADE.

IT will probably always remain true that men in general are ignorant of the history of their own times. The modern system of newspapers and telegrams puts us in possession of the news of the day, of which a great deal is false, and more only half true. It leaves an impression, more or less durable, on the mind, as to its general features, but as to specific facts and truths, the great mass of them vanish almost as fast as old newspapers themselves. History does not take or regain possession of them for years, and then its accounts are often found to be either new to men who have yet lived at the time with which those accounts deal, or to contradict in many respects the impressions under which they have lived during the interval. Then also, the news of the world is too much for us to digest. We are interested in our own affairs, and pay little attention to what passes beyond our own ken. English and Irish politics occupy the minds of thousands of Englishmen, and Americans go into a fever every four years which engrosses their attention during half the interval too much to make them care to follow the fantastic changes which the public life of Europe presents to the eyes of lookers on. At this moment, how many of us could stand an examination on the history for the last twenty years of Spain, or Germany, or the Roumanian provinces, or Austro-Hungary?

The story of the late war between France and Germany, and the political life of France since the fall of the Second Empire, will soon be portions of history as to which documents, at all events, will not be wanting. The military history of the war is being written on the Prussian side with an elaborate minuteness which leaves nothing untouched, and the inquiries instituted under the present Assembly in France have already thrown very clear light upon the doings of the so-called

"Government of National Defence." The formation of a revolutionary government has seldom been traced with so much minute accuracy, because it is seldom that the evidence of so many witnesses of all shades of opinion and party has been combined. In the main it is, we suppose, an oft repeated tale : revolutions, at least in France and in one or two other countries, have been of so frequent occurrence during the last hundred years, that there seems to be almost a science of their production, and the traditions and usages of such catastrophes are observed with remarkable accuracy. Still, if the tale is told, it can scarcely lose its melancholy interest as long as the elements of evil whose success it chronicles are active, vigorous, and aggressive, and a consideration of its incidents may serve at least to explain to those who, like ourselves, live in the habitual assurance of a political and social security and stability which we do not deserve, how it is that Frenchmen who have any regard for peace and law and justice and right and religion are so easily alarmed at what is called the Red Spectre, and are ready to cling to anything whatever in the shape of a Power which may rescue them from its violence. Such is the fruit of nearly a century of the "rights of man," "the national will" as the title for authority, of liberty, equality, and fraternity forced on the world by barricades, pikes, and guillotines.

The Empire of Louis Napoleon had many enthusiastic admirers on this side of the Channel. Its material success, hollow as it was, imposed upon the minds of men, and much was forgiven to a Cæsar who had "made" Italy one by treachery and violence, and who was understood to be at the bottom of the persecution of the Church which his armies outwardly protected. The Empire was acquiesced in by Frenchmen of the best stamp, and it raised many of the worst to fortune and power. The necessities of the Imperial *régime*, which could find no loyal and active servants among the more respectable politicians, as well as the luxurious immorality of the Court, filled many an important military post with incapable officers, and the *morale* of the army itself suffered from this favouritism of which all were aware. The war found France comparatively unprepared—as unprepared, perhaps, as England would have been found on a similar emergency. The greater part of the nation, however, were intoxicated with the enthusiasm of military aggression, which promised to give a relief to the feelings of alarmed jealousy towards Prussia which had been



brooding in so many hearts ever since Sadowa. It was, unfortunately, deemed by some who ought to have had higher and more Christian thoughts concerning so great a misery to mankind as an European war, to be a good opportunity of rallying the affections of the people to the dynasty of the Bonapartes, as it perhaps might for a time have rallied them had it been successful on the part of France. Below the surface the old agitation was already at work when war was proclaimed. The irreconcilable plotters against peace, religion, society, and law, the men whose companions had been shot down by Cavaignac after they had made the Revolution of 1848, whom Louis Napoleon had kept down by cannon at home, while he was sacrificing to them the peace of Italy and the prosperity of the Church, were joining in this universal cry for war, hounding on the army, which fondly hoped not to pause in its march till it reached Berlin, but all the while preparing their own game in case of an opportunity. The war was considered as a time for truce between the various political parties in the country, who were content to cease from rivalry during the time of danger. Not so the Red Republicans, the men of the Commune. The possible catastrophes, the defeat of French armies, the invasion of French territory, the march of destruction and death up to the very walls of the capital, would be to them the opportunity for another effort to destroy the dynasty and to add to the horrors of war those of revolution, first political and then social.

All the world knows how the opportunity came. On the 1st of September, 1870, General Palikao, the head of the Government at Paris, received a despatch from Mezieres, sent by General Vinoy, informing him that his communications with Sedan were completely broken, that he was inundated by fugitives, who brought the news that Marshal MacMahon was wounded, and that the battle was going unfavourably. The next day there was no fresh news in Paris, except what came by private telegrams from London and Brussels. MacMahon was dead, a part of the army and the Emperor himself made prisoner. Still there was no certainty till the Saturday afternoon, hours after the news had been known at London and perhaps at New York, when the Empress received a short telegram from her husband, *L'armée est défaite et captive, moi-même je suis prisonnier.*

France then was without an army, at least without an army that could avail for her defence, as Bazaine with his large force was shut up in Metz. No one could doubt that the Prussians

would very soon be in full march on Paris; indeed they had begun their march before the telegram could have reached the Empress. Such moments are the true tests of the stability of Constitutions and of the capacity of rulers. It must have been instantly in the minds of every one who heard the fatal news from Sedan, that the Empire was gone. As it was, the Ministry at Paris and the Empress herself had opposed his return to the capital after the disasters which had preceded MacMahon's fatal march to relieve Bazaine, in the instinctive dread that Paris would never again tolerate his presence. If a like catastrophe had happened to the Prussian army, no one would have thought for a moment of a change in the form of the government. The misfortune of the Austrian army at Sadowa was only less great and irretrievable than that of the French army at Sedan, yet no one at Vienna thought of dethroning Francis Joseph. Ancient monarchies have their roots in the soil, and can stand the storm of adversity. Empires, republics, United Italys, United Germanys, Confederations of the Rhine, and other members of the numerous brood of modern institutions are not so. A breath may blast them as a breath has created them. But still, Empire or no Empire, there was France to look to, France to save; and, to give them due credit, the first thought of the Empress and of her Ministers seems to have been for France rather than for the dynasty.

But the men in power were not equal to the emergency. They lost time, and when their arrangements were made they were insufficient. It is said that General Palikao, the chief and soul of the Council of Ministers, had passed many years of his life out of France, and was not well acquainted with the excitable and inflammable character of the population of Paris with which he had now immediately to deal. Certainly, as we read the account of his proceedings after the event, they appear to us to display a singular want of intelligence as to the danger which threatened the Government. Two hours after the arrival of the Emperor's telegram, the Ministers met in Council with the President of the Senate and of the Corps Legislatif. But it was decided to wait till the middle of the next day before any meeting of the Corps Legislatif should be held. A proclamation was drawn up, inviting the people by their union to contribute to the defence of the country. All the disposable troops were ordered to march towards Paris, and an army of three hundred thousand men was to be organized behind the

Loire. These were the only measures determined on by the Government. The whole night—and much can be done in a night in a city like Paris—was left for the machinations of the enemies of order, while its friends were divided among themselves as to the steps immediately to be taken, even when they were unanimous in a patriotic desire to avoid all questions which might tend to dissension, and imperil the already tottering chances of a successful defence or an honourable and not too one-sided peace.

The first movement of discontent with the temporizing policy of the Government came from the members of the Corps Legislatif itself. The President, M. Schneider, had hardly returned from the Council before some deputies came to him urging him to summon the members of the Corps to meet at midnight. M. Schneider yielded, and sent out his summons, though General Palikao and two others of the Ministers seem not to have received the notes addressed to them. At eleven, most of the Ministers and deputies were already at the Palace of the Chamber—the Opposition deliberating in one of the *bureaux* as to the measures which they would propose. At one o'clock in the morning the sitting was opened. General Palikao read the Emperor's telegram, and proposed an adjournment. Then M. Jules Favre rose, as representing the Opposition, and without objecting to the adjournment of the discussion, read the resolution which he intended to propose. It consisted of three articles. The first declared the *dechéance* of Louis Napoleon and his dynasty. The second provided for a Commission of Government to be named by the Chamber, which was to have full executive power and to undertake the mission of resisting the enemy *à l'outrance* and driving him out of France. The last article confirmed General Trochu in his post of Governor of Paris. This proposal was read, and, as it would seem, no other. Some sort of military dictatorship seems to have been suggested to Count Palikao, but he declined it. The Corps Legislatif then separated, to meet again at noon. Thus the *dechéance* of the Emperor was proposed without a single voice being lifted in protest, and twelve hours were to pass before the proposal was to be debated. Even at the time when this first short session of the Corps Legislatif broke up, the neighbourhood of the Palais Bourbon was crowded by an excited mob, who could hardly be restrained from violence. A meeting of journalists

and others was being held in the Rue Sourdère, where the rumour prevailed that General Palikao was about to attempt a *Coup d'État*.

It appears that the night before the last fatal telegram arrived from the Emperor, M. Thiers had been applied to by the Empress to assume the reins of Government. He had declined. His advice to his friends in the Corps Legislatif had been to form a Commission of Executive Power. This was the universal idea in the Corps itself during the short meeting which has just been spoken of. The only question was whether the Assembly—this word slips in as the most natural even in the official Report of Count Daru, which we are in the main following—should take upon itself to originate the Commission, or whether this should be brought about in a more regular manner by an understanding with the Empress and her Ministers. The scruples of a large number of deputies, who had sworn faithfulness to the Emperor and the Constitution, had to be consulted as to this last measure. It was proposed to the Council of Ministers that the Empress should send a message to the Corps Legislatif, declaring the powers under which she had hitherto carried on the Government to be now insufficient, and proposing that the Assembly should appoint a Government. This plan would have preserved the continuity in the Government, whatever form the Commission of Executive Power might have taken. But it was rejected by the Ministry. They preferred to propose the nomination of a Commission of Regency under the presidency of General Palikao. M. Thiers, meantime, prepared a proposal of his own, declaring the supreme power vacant, appointing a Commission, to be taken from the Corps Legislatif, as the Executive Government, and announcing the convocation, as soon as possible, of an *Assemblée Constituante*. Thus when the Corps at length met, there were three proposals before it—that of the Government, that of M. Thiers, and that of M. Jules Favre. In a country where Parliament had the confidence of the people and really represented it, it is possible that these three proposals might have been fairly debated, and that the nation might have waited in patience for the issue, even if the debate had lasted a day or two. In France, and particularly in Paris, there was no time for debate, and the two or three hours which might still have saved so much were really wasted, although they were spent in bringing the supporters of these

various proposals into a kind of harmony, because the masters of the mob of Paris were not inclined to trust their legislature even for so short a time.

It must be said, that under ordinary circumstances, the promptitude with which matters were arranged in the Chamber would deserve the highest praise. The *bureaux* into which the Chamber was divided named their representatives, these representatives met, and in half an hour they were able to report to the Chamber that they had agreed to the proposal of M. Thiers with some slight modifications. The word "vacant" was left out. The members of the Commission du Pouvoir Executif was fixed at five. Meanwhile, a deputation had waited on the Empress, and had obtained her consent to any surrender of her own powers which her Ministers might agree to. The parliamentary success of the proposal made by the Commission of the Bureaux was secured, and there seemed to be nothing more to be done than for the Assembly to name the members of the Government. But before this could be done, the Chamber itself had lost all control over the course of events.

It is idle to speculate as to the probable effect of the establishment of a moderate Commission of Government, composed of the most distinguished men in the Corps Legislatif, upon the question of successful resistance to the Prussian invasion, of a peace which would have left the greater part of France undevastated by war, her permanent resources unburthened by the terrible weight of a fabulous indemnity, and her frontiers still the same as before the fatal quarrel about the candidature of Prince Hohenzollern for the Spanish throne. It must, however, be clear that moderate proposals for peace would have had a far greater chance of success with King William and his astute Chancellor if they had come from a Government which could be trusted, and it is also historically certain that Russia would have guaranteed the integrity of the French territory if there had been no Revolution. It is also certain that the men who brought about the catastrophe in France—at least, its immediate authors, for the blame of having made their success possible must rest on other shoulders than theirs—were simply political fanatics of the Commune type, whose fanaticism did not prevent them from having a very keen eye for everything that might serve their own personal interests. These men brought to the critical moment

of the first day in Paris after the announcement of the misfortune of Sedan far greater determination, readiness, and activity than were to be found in the Ministerial Councils, or in the *bureaux* of the Chamber. They had long been biding their time with much anxiety, for their partisans had been waxing impatient, and yet their attempts in the latter years of the reign of Louis Napoleon had been uniformly unsuccessful. Still, they had kept up the practice of occasional demonstrations, both to animate the spirits of their followers, and also in the hope that if they did not gain their end one day they might gain it the next. The war with Prussia renewed their hopes; all the more when the first weeks of the war brought the news of so many reverses. After Reischoffen, it had been necessary to take precautions to insure the safety of the Corps Legislatif. General Baraguay d'Hilliers had kept order on the 5th and 13th of August. Later in the month, Blanqui led an attack on a corps de garde on the Boulevard de la Villette, which, however, failed.<sup>1</sup> On the Saturday before the news of Sedan arrived, there had been a similar attempt, and General Trochu had been obliged to harangue a mob, and promise that justice should be done on the poor *gardes de ville* who were accused of having fired on the people. The President and quæstors of the Chamber had applied to General Palikao to take fresh precautions. There can be little question that a population like that of Paris would have been full of excitement and violence at the receipt of such news as that of Sedan, even without secret machinations and intrigues, but it appears certain, nevertheless, that the actual explosion was arranged and organized beforehand.

Already, on September 3, M. de Keratry, who believed the revolution inevitable, and took some pains to make it so, had offered the post of Minister of War to General le Flo. M. de Keratry signalized himself by proposing, at the beginning of the sitting of the Corps Legislatif, that the protection of the Chamber should be taken out of the hands of the municipal guards, and intrusted to the National Guards. This was to propose a simple surrender to the mob, almost as much as the insertion in the *Siecle* of that morning of a short notice in small print, saying that thousands of National Guards had

<sup>1</sup> It appears that these attempts were well paid for. A certain Citoyen Granger spent his whole fortune, 18,000, francs in paying the men who made the attack at Villette.



agreed to meet before the Palace of the Corps Legislatif, was a direct incitement to disturbance. As a matter of fact, immense masses of *ouvriers* left their work before midday, and assembled near the appointed spot, while large bodies of National Guards, without arms, led by men wearing the *kepi* as a sign of command, marched on the same point. In vain did the President of the Assembly and the quæstors address reiterated requests for troops to General Palikao and General Trochu, the Governor of Paris, under whose command were the National Guards as well as the troops. No steps were taken, or if any were taken, they were miserably insufficient. The intended violation of the Assembly was so notorious, that one of the officials received a note from a friend asking for two tickets of admission, because he desired "assister à l'envahissement de l'Assemblée." Another, a former deputy of 1848, was in one of the tribunes expecting the moment. "At two o'clock," says the Report, "this M. Miot, tired of waiting, got up and said to those beside him, 'I am going to show you how a revolution is made.' He was absent for a quarter of an hour, and then came back, saying, '*La Revolution est faite.*'"

The actual way of proceeding seems to have been simple enough. Deputies in the interests of the Revolution went to the gates and persuaded the officials there to let in their friends five or six at a time. In this way the tribunes were filled with insurgents. Other deputies went out and stood on the steps of the portico, waving their handkerchiefs to the National Guards, and encouraging them to force their way in. Others urged the municipal guards to make way for the National Guards. At last, the general in command of the small force of troops, between two and three thousand men, young recruits, who were on the spot, gave orders for the municipal guards to retire, and at the same time the gates were opened to the National Guards and the crowd which accompanied them. In a few moments the whole building was in the possession of the insurgents—before the deputies could return to the hall from their *bureaux* where they had been discussing the three futile projects for a Commission of Government of which we have spoken. When the *rapporteur* of the Commission presented himself to propose to the Chamber the resolution which had been so quickly agreed to, he found the Chamber itself no longer capable of deliberation.

General Palikao was there in his place. The President, M. Schneider, took his seat. M. Gambetta went to the tribune and endeavoured to calm the tumult, by promising the people that the *dechéance* of the Empire would be pronounced, at the same time that he entreated them to let it be pronounced freely. Then was heard the smashing in of the doors, and the breaking of windows, a tricolour flag was brought in and waved, and notwithstanding the efforts of the deputies themselves, the space devoted to them was soon entirely filled with strangers. M. Schneider, at last, declared the sitting at an end, all deliberation being impossible. He himself escaped with great difficulty, as he was recognized by the crowd, hustled, beaten, and half killed. But he managed to get home. Two deputies who accompanied him, M. Chesnelong and M. Boduin, were severely bruised and hurt.

Meanwhile, M. Gambetta was again in the tribune. He declared, in the name of those present, and amid their applause, that as the country was in danger, and the Assembly had had time enough given to it to pronounce the *dechéance* of Louis Napoleon, without doing so, the people now pronounced it themselves. M. Jules Favre entered as this was being done. He rushed to the tribune, and proposed that a Provisional Government should be proclaimed, but he urged the mob to do this at the Hotel de Ville. He said afterwards that he was frightened at the threatening aspect of the mob, and wished to get them away from the Corps Legislatif. Another deputy proposed the immediate proclamation of the Republic, but he was opposed by M. Gambetta, as well as by M. Jules Favre. The latter seems to have had some idea that if the building of the Corps Legislatif were evacuated by the mob, the members might still proceed to the formal declaration of the *dechéance*. At all events, there is a sort of rule about French Revolutions, and they seem ordinarily to attain to their majority, so to speak, at the Hotel de Ville. Thither M. Favre, M. Gambetta, and the mob set out to give the final touch to the improvised revolution of September, 1870. Meanwhile—and the fact seems to show the readiness of invention which the authors of the new Republic seem to have added to their other brilliant qualities—the rumour was spread that the Corps Legislatif had regularly divided on the question of the establishment of the Republic, and that the division had issued in an immense

majority for the affirmative.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, the Prefect of Police, M. Pietri, had been summoned by the Empress, and had urged her to immediate flight. She got into a *fiacre* with one lady, and made her way out of Paris.

The scene must now be shifted to the Hotel de Ville. After the mob had been persuaded to evacuate the Palace of the Assembly, it marched, with M. Jules Favre and Jules Ferry at its head, along the right bank of the Seine to the Hotel de Ville; another party, with M. Gambetta, M. de Keratry, and M. Spuller, went along the left bank. Other well-known Republicans, such as M. Emmanuel Arago and M. Cremieux, soon joined those present. The Hotel de Ville was already thronged. There was a good deal of violent discussion, for the Socialists and ultra-Republicans were ready to put in their claim to a share of the Government which they had done so much to create. Felix Pyat made his attempt, but Gambetta put him down. It became clear that for the moment the more moderate of the revolutionists were in the ascendancy. The members of the Government, as originally proclaimed by acclamation, were to have been MM. Jules Favre, Picard, Gambetta, Jules Ferry, Emmanuel Arago, and Cremieux. The process of acclamation seems to have been simple enough. The names of the members of the Government were written on bits of paper and thrown out to the crowd below, who cheered approval, and thus ratified the appointment. The Government installed itself in a small room to draw up a proclamation, which was taken off to be printed, but it was with some difficulty that a printing office could be found where the men would work. Meanwhile, a new recruit joined the Government—no other than M. Henri Rochefort, who had been rescued from his prison by a mob, and was now carried, with quite as much of acclamation as the rest, to the seat of power. There was also another recruit at the Hotel de Ville at the same moment, of whom we shall speak presently. But we must first say a few words as to the final acts of the members of the Corps Legislatif.

If M. Jules Favre had had no other intention in proposing to the mob to adjourn to the Hotel de Ville, than to set his colleagues of the Assembly at liberty, his plan must be allowed to have succeeded to a considerable extent. The mob gradually

<sup>2</sup> The numbers were given at one hundred and eighty out of two hundred and thirteen votes. Papers with these numbers were circulated, and flags sold on which they were inscribed.

left the building, and, as far as appears, there was no attempt made to ill-treat the deputies. About an hour after the sitting had been suspended, there were as many as a hundred and seventy still on the spot. It was proposed that they should hold a sitting. The hall in which the sittings were usually held was still to some extent crowded, but they adjourned to the residence of the President, and a meeting was held in his dining-room, although M. Schneider himself was too much injured by the treatment which he had received to be able to attend. The members present were aware that some of their colleagues had gone off to the Hotel de Ville, and their memory of former French Revolutions must have suggested to them that the proceedings there were not likely to breathe a spirit of deep respect for already constituted authorities. But they seem to have determined to make an effort to preserve to some extent the standing of the Corps Legislatif, as the only body existing in France which could be said to have emanated from the suffrage of the nation. M. Garnier Pagès proposed that the resolution, which was to have been presented to the Chamber by the *rapporteur* after the deliberations in the *bureaux* on the three proposals mentioned above, should now be voted, with the difference that the words declaring the vacancy of the executive power, which had been omitted in a spirit of compromise, should now be reinserted. It was also agreed that a deputation should be sent to the Hotel de Ville, to M. Jules Favre or any other members of the Chamber who might be there, in order to bring about, if possible, some arrangement by which the authority of the national representatives might be brought in to sanction what had been or might be done, and thus be preserved from entire destruction. The Chamber had, no doubt, a shrewd suspicion that the first act of a Provisional Government would be to dissolve any body that might compete with it or control it. The deputation set out, but like everything else on the side of order or legality on that memorable day, it was too late. The Provisional Government was already installed. M. Jules Favre told M. Grevy, the head of the deputation, how "profoundly touched" he was at the step which his former colleagues had taken: he promised to confer with the other members of the Provisional Government, and to come himself in the evening to the assemblage of deputies at the President's house. He came at the appointed time—thanked the Assembly, or what remained of it, for their offer of cooperation, but declared that he and his

companions had gone too far to recede, a movement had been set on foot which had carried them away, corresponding as it did "au sentiment intime de nos âmes." They would devote themselves to the task of defending France and Paris, and would be very glad if the Corps Legislatif would ratify their acts. If it refused, they would respect the consciences of their former colleagues, but would take the liberty of following their own.

It is something to find that the members of the Corps Legislatif, who were thus addressed, did not accept the invitation to ratify the proceedings at the Hotel de Ville. M. Thiers was the spokesman who was chosen to convey the refusal clearly but courteously. He then advised the deputies to return to their homes. It would be unpatriotic, he told them, to resist the new Government, and at the same time they could make no arrangement with it. "It was not proper either to recognize a Government to which an insurrection has given birth, or to combat it when there was the enemy to fight with." The members separated quietly. The next day a great number met in the house of M. Johnston, and drew up a protest against the violent dissolution of the Assembly, which only one Paris paper ventured to publish. The two Chambers, that of the Senate—of which we hear nothing in all this history—and the Corps Legislatif, were locked up the same night by order of the new Government.

We must now pass to a name which must have often been in the minds of our readers who have had the patience to follow our narrative up to the present point. What was General Trochu about all this time? What was his attitude towards the Government which was overthrown, and what his share in the erection of that of which he was so soon to appear as the most conspicuous member? General Trochu had many admirers even in England at the beginning of the war, and during the siege of Paris he received a large share of general sympathy. Yet few names of those who were prominent at that time have sunk into oblivion so deep as his, or rather, his position and influence in France seems to be altogether lost. There may be many reasons for this which do not strike the eye, and we are far from desiring to be hard on a man of singularly high character. But it can hardly be denied that General Trochu, if he had nothing to do with the revolution which brought so many disasters on France, might at least have prevented it, that his attitude during this momentous day was by no means loyal to the Government, and that, however good his motives may have

been in joining the Provisional Government, his doing so was an act of weakness which entailed many subsequent compromises of principle, and which can only be excused on the ground that things might have been much worse if he had refused, and that everything ought to have been set aside in consideration of the paramount duty of endeavouring to save France.

General Trochu had from the first no cordial relations with General Palikao. His presence in Paris as Governor was a symbol of the discord of opinion which did so much to insure the ruin of France. He was no favourite of the Emperor, and had been left out in the distribution of commands for the war; but when affairs began to take a disastrous turn, he had become a necessity, and the Emperor had made him Governor of Paris. This post had been refused him by the Ministry before he went to Chalons to confer with the Emperor. His plan for the campaign of defence had been altogether different from that which was followed, so unfortunately for France. He had urged that the Emperor should return to Paris, and that the forces under Marshal MacMahon should be concentrated under the walls of the capital. The Ministry and the Empress would not hear of the return of Louis Napoleon, and they were bent on sending MacMahon to release Bazaine. It will now be acknowledged, perhaps, by most good judges who have studied the story of the siege, that the one thing wanting to the defence of Paris was an army to join in that defence. Indeed, we can hardly fix upon any one measure among the many blunders of the French Government which was so utterly fatal in its results as the march of MacMahon on Sedan. It is easy to be wise after the time, but General Trochu may fairly claim to have been wise in this matter before the time. His divergence of views from those of General Palikao was not the only cause of coldness and jealousy between them. Palikao did not like his eighteen battalions of Mobiles; he did not like the proclamation which Trochu issued as Governor of Paris without any communication with the Cabinet, or a letter which he published in one of the papers in which he spoke of his horror and disgust at the idea of maintaining order in Paris by the bayonet and the sabre; he did not like his intimate relations with the leading members of the Parliamentary Opposition, among whom were several of his future colleagues in the Provisional Government. Moreover, there were constant occasions on which the two generals came into collision. The Minister of War was of course supreme as to the disposal of the



troops, and General Trochu, without denying his supremacy, was frequently forced to complain that he was deprived of forces which were necessary for the task committed to him. Trochu's character was independent, his manner cold; he showed little disposition to risk his own popularity for the sake of the Government to which he had always been opposed.

General Palikao made a final and fatal blunder on the very day of the Revolution in his conduct as to General Trochu. The Minister, as we have said, is thought to have been remarkably ignorant, for a Frenchman, of the inflammable and dangerous character of the Parisian mob, and he never seems to have understood that any delay, or any false step, on such a day as that 4th of September, might at once be fatal to the Government and to France. When he was warned, and entreated to take precautionary measures, he answered that there was no fear, he had forty thousand men in Paris. When the day came, however, he did order a certain force to be at hand for the protection of the Assembly, but he put the battalions under the command of General Soumain, without communicating the arrangement to General Trochu. It was a slight which the Governor resented, and he seems to have let things take their course when energetic action on his own part might perhaps have prevented the ultimate issue. He waited on the Empress in the morning, and then remained quiet in the Louvre. The Prefect of Police informed him of the preparations made for the manifestation, and he must have been able to see from his windows the assemblage of the crowd, and its threatening march on the Chamber. General Trochu did nothing. It was not till three in the afternoon that he was persuaded by General Lebreton to mount his horse and appear for the defence of the Legislature. It was too late—the crowd was already making its way to the Hotel de Ville, after having put an end to the deliberations of the Chamber, and General Trochu returned to his quarters to wait the issue of events.

In the course of an hour or more, some members of the Government presented themselves with the list, as far as it had been already drawn up, and begged him to join them at the Hotel de Ville.

It must have been with great misgivings that General Trochu consented. We need not suppose that he was ambitious for himself, or that anything determined him but a sense of

the supreme necessity of France, which must now be saved through the Government which had just been set up, unless another was to be forcibly established at the cost of blood, or perhaps of civil war. Still, to throw his great reputation and his sword into the scale in favour of a revolt was a sacrifice to an honourable soldier, and if the deputies of the Corps Legislatif hesitated to sanction the new Government, it could not have been without scruple that Trochu joined them. Join them, however, he did. He made his way to the Hotel de Ville with some difficulty in plain clothes. He stipulated that three principles should be held sacred—God, the family, and property. His colleagues assented to this. He then required that he should be made the President of the Council of the new Government. This also was granted. He seems to have thought that unless he were the head of the Government, he would not be able to secure the allegiance of the army to the new state of things. He then went to pay a visit to General Palikao at the Ministry of War; a visit intended on his part as an act of deference, but which, as Count Daru's Report says, might very well at such a moment astonish the recipient. General Palikao was preparing for instant flight, having been warned by M. Cremieux that he would speedily be arrested. On returning from this strange visit of ceremony to the Hotel de Ville, General Trochu found M. Rochefort, lately delivered by violence from prison, associated with himself as a member of the new Government. He protested, but acquiesced. It was represented to him that M. Rochefort was safer in the Government than outside it; an argument which might just as well have been used as to Blanqui or Delescluzes. But the whole course of events showed that General Trochu might be the President of the Government, but not its ruling spirit, and his first weak concession to the violent party gave a character to the new order of things which it preserved to the end, and which it is a misfortune to his fair fame not to have at once eliminated.

Besides M. Rochefort, the new Government had received a far more respectable addition to its members in the person of M. Garnier Pagès, one of the old Commission of Executive Power, which reigned for a short time after the Revolution of 1848. Ultimately, the Government came to be composed of the deputies for Paris, to whom were added M. Picard and M. Jules Simon, both of whom had been returned for Paris, but had

chosen to sit for other places. They were all well known Republicans. The composition of the new Government therefore already foreshadowed what was to be its policy—that it was not to attempt to unite men of all parties and opinions in one common band for the defence of the country, but was to use its usurped power for the promotion of a particular class of ideas and interests. This original taint of the Government gave a character to all its acts. What appears to have been either an accident or a clever *coup* on the part of the ambitious man who had afterwards more to do with the mismanagement of affairs than any other, enhanced the intensely partisan and selfish character in the new *régime*. M. Montpayroux testified to the Commission of Inquiry, whose Report to the present National Assembly we are using, that M. Picard, a far more moderate man, was, in the understanding of the majority of the members of the Provisional Government, appointed to the all-important post of Minister of the Interior. But M. Leon Gambetta outstripped him, got first to the hotel of the Ministry, and despatched a telegram all over France to the civil and military authorities, stating that the *dechéance* of the dynasty had been proclaimed at (!) the Corps Legislatif, the Republic established at the Hotel de Ville, and eleven deputies of Paris had been acclaimed as the Government of the National Defence. He signed the despatch, "Leon Gambetta, *Minister of the Interior*." After this it was difficult to get rid of him, and when the matter was discussed the same evening at the Hotel de Ville, his appointment was carried by a single vote.

The story is told in a different way by M. Picard himself, but as to the most important point his statement only confirms what has just been said. He too states, and it is undeniable, that when M. Gambetta signed the telegraphic despatch as Minister of the Interior, he had even less right to do so than he had to give the prefects and generals to whom he addressed himself to understand that the Corps Legislatif had pronounced the *dechéance* of Louis Napoleon. M. Picard agrees that the appointment was not made till nearly midnight. But M. Picard tells us that the question which was then decided by a single vote was not the personal issue between M. Gambetta and himself. The debate turned upon the policy of the Government, and the triumph of M. Gambetta was the triumph of that disastrous system of the pursuit of party interests of which we have spoken.

Two policies [says the Report, p. 17] were in competition—that which M. Gambetta supported and which may be called the policy of party, for it tended to the establishment and consolidation of the Republic by the exclusive assistance of the men who, for a longer or shorter time, had been occupied in endeavours to make that form of Government prevail, and another which made political interests subordinate to the National Defence, and which appealed to devotion wherever it was to be found, and to the union of all citizens in the same sentiment of patriotism. M. Picard supported this policy, and asked the Council to adopt it.

Majorities of one have often had very important issues, and this particular majority must be numbered among those whose results have been most mischievous. The result showed, indeed, that there was an immense fund of patriotism in France, a fund which it was difficult to exhaust, and which might be depended upon for the most heroic sacrifices. Good men of all parties readily obeyed even the violent, unscrupulous, and incompetent dictatorship soon afterwards grasped by M. Gambetta himself. It must be quite clear that the only hope for the salvation of France lay in the hearty union of all parties under the best Government that could be found, and the Government which actually was installed was one of the worst. If it did not force on the Prussians the continuance of the war *à l'outrance*, and the rejection of all reasonable proposals for peace, it at least gave them the excuse for all this. And more than this—it directly prepared the way for the excesses of the Commune. It put men in power all over France and in Paris who would hardly wait for the conclusion of the war to begin a fresh internecine war against society itself in the bosom of their own country. We are apt, as has already been said, to wonder at the alarm which the danger from a Socialist Republic creates in the minds of most respectable Frenchmen. But the Commune and its principles more than justify that alarm, and the administration of M. Gambetta together with the adoption of his principles by the Government of National Defence, quite sufficiently account for the subsequent reign of the Commune.

Like most such Governments, this was not deficient in activity. Decrees appeared the next morning abolishing the Senate, dissolving the *Corps Legislatif*, declaring an absolute and general amnesty for all political prisoners, and declaring the manufacture and sale of arms free to all. M. Gambetta set at once to work to "purify" the *personnel* of the department which he had so cleverly conjured for himself. He had hundreds of political friends to satisfy, men of a far darker colour as to

principles than himself, and he imported them wholesale into the public offices. He named mayors and prefects all over the country at once, men whose violent political partisanship was only equalled by their incompetence. The other members of the Government were not consulted. General Trochu remonstrated—but he did no more. And, after all, even M. Gambetta did not go far enough to satisfy his friends. Complaints were made that the persons named were not good enough republicans!

And yet, all the time, the Government of the National Defence, playing as it did into the hands of the most rabid of the Socialists, was looked upon by them with suspicion and hatred. No sooner was the Government formed at the Hotel de Ville, than another power was organized to control and overthrow it. That same evening a meeting of the International and of the Federations Ouvrières was held in the Place de la Corderie du Temple—the first of many meetings at which the whole programme of the revolutionary party was arranged from time to time. The minutes of these meetings fell into the hands of the Government after the suppression of the Commune, and furnish the Report before us with some of its most significant passages. At the first meeting it was agreed not to attack the Provisional Government, on account of the war, and because the “popular forces” were not yet sufficiently organized. But it was resolved to demand the instant suppression of the Prefecture of Police, the dismissal of all the existing magistrates, the organization of a “municipal” police, and the repeal of all restrictions on rights of association and the liberty of the press. A Municipality was to be immediately elected for Paris. A Central Committee was at once formed, consisting of delegates elected by the *ouvriers* of the several *arrondissements* of Paris. The “demonstrations” and attacks on the Government which followed at short intervals during September and October were all organized and arranged by this Committee. The International chiefs who were still in London counselled more moderation and less rapid progress than the Committee in Paris were willing to adopt; and at one time (October 31) these last actually succeeded for some hours in obtaining possession of the Hotel de Ville, where they made the members of the Government of National Defence their prisoners. Happily, M. Picard managed to escape, and while the insurgents were banquetting on the dinner prepared for the Government and sending envoys to the Ministry of Finance with a cheque for

fifteen millions of francs, he managed to organize a rescue, and Paris was saved for the moment. There, however, the enemy was, within the walls, more bloodthirsty, more irreconcilable, more unscrupulous as to its means, more destructive in its aim, than any German army that ever crossed the Rhine.

"M. Jules Favre, M. J. Simon, M. J. Ferry, General Trochu, M. Picard did not deceive themselves. They have all said in their depositions that they found themselves from the very beginning face to face with the Commune. They felt that that was their adversary, they knew it, but they did not then foresee of what crimes the Commune was capable.

"Their illusion was shared by others. The evil was seen, but its depths were not sounded. And yet the Commune was nothing new; it was but a hateful revival of a system which had been dominant during a part of the first Revolution. But after a time the recollections of the past are effaced and retire from the memories of men. Party spirit disfigures, by lying declamations, the most authenticated facts, and does not shrink from rehabilitating and sometimes even glorifying, the most serious crimes. This perversion of history has had a great deal to do with the recurrence of attempts which public reprobation ought at once to have blasted and prevented.

"Yes—it is painful, but it is necessary to say it, the Commune of the 10th of August, 1790, that abhorred power which, after having subdued Paris and strangled France, left behind it nothing but the shameful and bloody traces of its passage—which, after having begun by assassination, became the docile servant of the orders of Marat, formed lists of proscriptions, ordered the most arbitrary arrests, and organized those terrible *travailleurs* who rushed into the prisons to do their deadly work at the rate of "twenty-four *sous* a head, wine included"—that Commune, with all its perquisitions, confiscations, and massacres, found men who wished to revive it in our own days, who laboured for this end in the very face of the enemy, and who waited for the favourable moment when the Prussian cannon had ceased to roar, and when France was entirely exhausted, in order to attempt to make it triumph.

"The Commune," continues the Report, whose words we are adopting, "is nothing but the anonymous despotism of certain men; that is to say, the most intolerable of all despotisms.

"The Federation of Communes is nothing but the federation of local despotisms, over which a central despotism is placed.



"This was the programme which the Revolutionary party had adopted after the 4th of September. This was the means by which it hoped to rule in Paris, and by the help of Paris to subjugate the provinces."

Every one knows how much bloodshed and destruction it cost to put down the Commune. The Revolution by which the Third French Republic was established, must be judged by the Government of National Defence, which was its immediate creation, but also by the Commune, which was its legitimate child.

It was one of the boasts of the new Government of National Defence, or rather of the admirers of the Revolution which set it on foot, that it had cost so little. There was no resistance, and consequently no bloodshed. The Empire, with its Senate and Corps Legislatif, was brushed away in a moment like a cobweb. Yes, but the Empire had lasted not very far short of a score of years, and during that time it had represented in France that divinely sanctioned system of law and government on the maintenance of which the peace of the world, the prosperity of the country, the existence even of the elementary conditions of human society as instituted by its Maker, depended. It sat in the seat of justice and wielded the authority of law; it condemned and punished; it called millions of men from their homes, and made them its soldiers, sending them to slaughter or be slaughtered by their fellow-men and fellow-Christians, according to the good pleasure of a few men to whom it had committed its power. It was obeyed for conscience' sake by all that was good and high-principled in France, even when its own policy was clearly neither good nor high-principled, nor in accordance with the truest interests and the noblest traditions of the country. It is no matter of boasting that a few thousands of Parisian workmen, guided by a few dozen conspirators against society, could in a few hours knock this whole system to pieces with as light hearts as if it were a fabric of pasteboard, and entail upon the sound and serious portion of the community the necessity of either making a counter-revolution, or of submitting to be led in the struggle for the very existence of France by a handful of adventurers.

### *The Church and the trial by Ordeal.*

---

THE ordeal, as the word signifies, was in its general character a mode of determining the innocence or guilt of the person who underwent the trial. By it an appeal was made to God to manifest the truth by an external sign, to interfere in favour of the innocent, or against the guilty, by a miraculous interposition, and to bring His unerring knowledge to the aid of human ignorance. The very essence then of the ordeal rested on the presumption that God would, when appealed to, answer. If we go a little deeper into the ideas which underlie such systems, we find them resting on principles which cannot be entirely condemned—which, indeed, we are continually forced to maintain against modern falsehoods concerning the origin of society. As the ground of all, we find the principle that God is the Author of the social system. From Him comes all the authority of law. He alone, in the Christian view, can confer the power of the lawgiver and the judge. He alone can authorize human justice to execute its sentence either upon single men or upon men banded together in a community. It is a step beyond this, to imagine that God will always secure in particular cases the unerringness of human tribunals, that He will always provide for the detection of the guilty or vindicate the innocence of those who may be falsely accused. It is a further step to imagine that human justice is not to be administered according to human testimony, and that if there be in this any failure, God may be directly appealed to to supplement it; and a still further step to neglect human evidence altogether, and call at once for a preternatural interference to guide the decisions of the human tribunal. These last steps all show the narrow and inadequate views of God's dealings with mankind, which naturally came in as primitive traditions became more and more obscure, and as superstition took the place of the primeval religion of the whole race. As this process went on, vice, immorality, and crime of every kind multiplied,

and the invariable consequence of the progress of vice is the progress of cruelty. As religion degenerated into polytheism and devil-worship, religious rites, or those rites which went by the name, became more and more bloody and inhuman. Just in the same way, law became more savage, harder upon the accused, more ruthless in its punishments. The accused was the weaker, and all the weaker elements in society, women, children, the poor, slaves, and the like, were dealt with more ferociously as the light of truth faded. Thus, not to wander further from our present subject, it can easily be imagined how what was at first the appeal of the innocent to the protection of a special Providence in peculiar cases, when perhaps the security of domestic peace and faith, or of the community itself, was imperilled if the charge were true which yet could not be proved to be false, came to be a barbarous rule, disrespectful to God and cruel to man.

It is evident that such a scheme could only exist in a semi-civilized community. Under the old Roman law probably no traces can be found of it, if we except the trial by torture, which however was only applied to slaves. The same remark will also apply, with the same exception, to the Greeks. But before the barbarians of Europe came in contact with Rome and were vanquished by their down-trodden mistress, they naturally employed the surest, or at least the readiest means of punishing wrong and injustice. In a state of society which was founded indeed upon the elementary principles of morality and law, but lacked the more remote and practical deductions from those principles, which too had not yet learnt in the school of experience when and under what circumstances a certain law of conduct was to be strictly adhered to, and when it might and should be subject to limitation, in such a stage of civilization men would grasp at whatever appeared for the moment equitable, and upon repeated instances of a certain line of action build up a practical code, to be followed whenever the same set of circumstances presented itself.

Our Teutonic ancestors in their primæval forests, and much more amid the turmoil of migration and battle, could not in the nature of events have spent their superfluous energy upon the construction of any system of law. Their jurisprudence, if it deserve such a name, was suited to the character of the people, and to the state of society. Being ever on the move and liable to daily disturbance from without, they guarded

themselves against annoyance from each other in the swiftest and simplest fashion. The wandering droves of human beings who spread themselves over vast tracks of country and harassed every corner of the Roman Empire, when beset by difficulty or want, easily forgot their inborn rudimentary respect for life and property; and this respect had to be maintained by sharp and instantaneous reprisal. The rude assaults upon these two precious rights, which must have been common in the above state of society, led the way to a general recognition of the principle that an accused man must be presumed guilty until he proved himself innocent of the crime with which he was charged. This theory was an expression of the paramount right of the public body to its corporate safety over that of the individual. It was the despairing cry of an uncultivated people against its own vices; and it is an unerring guide to a true estimate of law and order when opposed to savage barbarism.

In course of time the great Germanic people formed itself into stable communities, and as it cleared away the rubbish of the overthrown structure of Rome, its good sense led it to preserve, as far as possible, the political and legal arrangements on which the ruined Empire had been framed. But while the old Roman law was adopted in principle, it did not altogether and in every case supersede the Teutonic customs on which it was engrafted. All that might be hoped for would be that the new infusion should gradually inoculate the nations, and wean them from the most barbarous of their own institutions. Hence it cannot cause any surprise that many of these latter were long cherished, and that it needed all the divine skill and patience of the Church, backed by repeated efforts on the part of secular Governments, to break down the wild and wayward spirit of our forefathers. In the case of ordeals we find the people to have been singularly slow in seeing their irrational and immoral nature. They were clung to with a tenacity which neither spiritual influence nor penal legislation nor ridicule could for a long time overcome, and it was not till the middle of the fifteenth century that they disappeared, and even then only to be replaced by the more brutal method of torture.<sup>1</sup>

The mildest and most equitable form of ordeal was that by compurgation. When a man was accused of any crime, he at

<sup>1</sup> The trial of witches by the water ordeal must be excepted. This lasted till comparatively recent times.

once fell under the presumption, according to the old Teutonic law above mentioned, of being guilty. In order to prove his innocence a certain number of persons were chosen, whose duty it was to sustain and corroborate the oath of the accused by their own as to his innocence of the crime in question. These compurgators, who varied in number according to the rank of the accused and the crime of which he was accused, were always taken from among the neighbours, and more commonly from among the friends of the accused. That they should know the truth was not necessary. Their whole and sole duty was to pledge their oath that they believed the oath of their accused neighbour or friend. In some cases, however, this form of defence was not admissible; for example, when the accused was a woman or not a freeman, or when the compurgators were distrusted by the accuser. At times the accused could not get a sufficient number of friends to support him. In these cases a further process was needful. On the Continent, judicial combat might follow when the accuser and accused were men; and although the challenge to single combat given by Edmund Ironside to Cnut is adduced to show that this form of trial was legally recognized in pre-Norman England, it must still remain in doubt, as we do not find any other instances of it. There remained then the direct appeal to God's judgment. The mode of appeal determined the character of the ordeal. If it was by a solemn oath and by the reception of the Blessed Eucharist, it was a *judicium canonicum*; so called because ecclesiastical councils and synods approved of this test. If the appeal was made by fire, hot water, &c., it was a *judicium vulgare*; so called because, as the Popes and Councils often say, it was *vulgi inventio, superstitiosa inventio, nulla lege fulta*, &c.

It is to this second kind of ordeal that these pages are devoted. This second appeal then was usually made by the ordeals of the ploughshare, of the red-hot bar of iron, of the hot and cold water, or of the cursed morsel. The first and last of these have been rendered famous in English history by the stories of Queen Emma, Edward the Confessor's mother, and Godwin, the Earl of the West Saxons. In the first form, nine ploughshares were laid upon the ground red-hot. The accused walked over them with bare feet. If he suffered no injury from the experiment, he was judged to have had his innocence attested by the direct interposition of heaven. This form of

ordeal is recognized as legal in the Longobardic code—"If he [the accused] deny that he has committed the murder, let him go to nine hot ploughshares, to be tested by the judgment of God." And in the laws of Edward the Confessor we read—"If he cannot defend himself, let justice be done upon him by the judgment of God, namely, by water or iron." The story of Emma runs, that she, for some unknown reason, had incurred the enmity of the powerful Earl Godwin and his family, and that she was accused to her son Edward of having, in her relations with Alwin the Bishop of Winchester, forgotten both her own position and his. The credulous Edward hastened down to Winchester, where she was living in retirement, confiscated her property, and put her under strict watch in the monastery of Werwell.

This occasioned the ordeal. Emma appealed to the judgment of God, says Ranulphus Cestrensis, and it was determined by Robert, the Archbishop of Canterbury, that she should prove her innocence by passing over nine red-hot ploughshares with bare feet, taking nine steps without stopping for herself, and five for the Bishop. If she were unhurt after this trial, she would be adjudged to have established her innocence. A fast of three days preceded the ordeal, and during that time she, according to custom, fed upon bread and salt, water and lentils. On the morning of the trial she heard Mass, during which the ploughshares were heated, after which a number of prayers, suitable to the occasion, were said. All these preparations were made in presence of ecclesiastical and royal witnesses, whose duty it was to see that the prescribed forms were accurately observed. Queen Emma spent the night preceding her trial before the tomb of St. Swithin. "The next day," says Harpsfield, "after the performance of the usual ceremonies, she is led by two bishops in tears, one on each side of her, clad in poor garments and barefoot, over the nine heated ploughshares in the Church of St. Swithin, while the people looked on. And she, with her eyes fixed on heaven without ever turning them upon the floor, and at the same time earnestly commending her cause to the protection of God, like Susanna of old, took nine steps across the bars. On the other hand the people, who in tears were anxiously awaiting the issue, called with one voice on God and St. Swithin for help. The bishops were now going out of the church, when she inquired, 'When shall we reach the ploughshares?' They, with eyes filled with tears, answered that



she had trodden upon and walked over them all, and had splendidly cleared her fame in the eyes of all. She then looked back, saw the ploughshares, and perceived that she had gone through the ordeal. She then returned hearty thanks to God and St. Swithin. The people, hearing what had happened, danced and shouted with joy and delight."

We may here notice the *purgatio canonica*, or ordeal as approved frequently by ecclesiastical authorities. It consisted of a solemn oath sworn at the time of Communion and before the reception of the Blessed Sacrament by the accused. The ordeal is repeatedly approved in local and metropolitan synods, and fixed as the only legitimate one for clerics. This, or one very similar, was appealed to by several saints, and even imposed upon a suspected man by St. Augustine himself. It was not confined to the clergy; we see the Church constantly exerting her influence to effect the substitution of this for the more barbarous forms so common. There are, however, many instances among the records of the middle ages, which show how easily and fearfully this equitable mode of purgation might be abused. A well known case is that of Lothair the Second, King of Austrasia, who, at Monte Cassino in A.D. 869, received the Eucharist from Pope Adrian the Second, as a proof that he was innocent of the charge of infidelity to his Queen Theotberga, from whom he was vainly soliciting the Pope to divorce him. Within a short time after this Lothair was carried off suddenly by fever, and the people saw in this a just judgment of God upon the perjurer of Monte Cassino. A story is told of Gregory the Seventh, clearing himself in this manner from the charge of having ascended the chair of St. Peter by simony. It would, however, seem to be nothing more than an incident imported into the great historial drama of the relations between Henry the Fourth of Germany and the Pope. Its occurrence is set down to the year 1077, and the time was that when Henry made a hollow peace with Gregory and was absolved from excommunication. The story relates how the Pope then offered Holy Communion to Henry in token of the sincerity of the mutual reconciliation, a pledge the monarch wisely declined to give by reason of his unworthiness!

The ordeal of the cursed morsel, *corsnaed*, *offa judiciaria*, which seems to have prevailed chiefly among the English and the Frisians, was of various forms. Commonly a piece of blessed bread was given during Mass to the accused man by the priest, and if he could not swallow it, he was adjudged

guilty. If he were guilty, and he succeeded in swallowing it, it was supposed that it would kill him. A well known instance of this form of ordeal, is the case of Godwin, the Earl of the West Saxons.<sup>2</sup> This nobleman was accused of being the principal agent in the barbarous murder of Alfred, Edward the Confessor's brother. The Saxon chronicler, and after him Florence of Worcester, roundly assert his guilt. Though he seems to have been acquitted of the charge in some kind of judicial process, the stain still stuck to his character both in public estimation and in the eyes of the King. Godwin knew this, and was clearly chafed by it. The biographer of the Confessor relates how (on Easter Monday, A.D. 1053) Godwin was dining at the King's table when one of the attendant's stumbled, but was saved from a fall by the ready assistance of another's arm. The incident, when observed upon, called forth from Godwin the jocose remark—"Thus does a brother help a brother, and one assist another in his need." The King said—"Thus would my brother have done to me, had Godwin allowed it." At this remark Godwin was alarmed, and with sorrowful countenance answered—"I know, O King, I know; still does thy mind accuse me of thy brother's death, and thou ceasest not to put credit in those who accuse me of being his and thy betrayer. Now let God, the knower of all secrets, be my judge, and may He let this morsel which I hold in my hand pass my throat and keep me unscathed as I am conscious of being neither traitorous to thee nor the cause of thy brother's murder." And when the holy man (the King) had raised his hand and blessed the morsel, the hapless wretch put it into his mouth and got it to the middle of his throat. He tries to swallow it further and fails; he tries to bring it back and it sticks the tighter. Presently his windpipe is stopped, his eyes turn up and his arms stiffen. The King gazes on the dying wretch, and seeing that the divine vengeance had stricken him, he says to the bystanders—"Take out that dog." "This Godwin," adds the biographer, "had played upon the ingenuous character of the King, and had done much in the kingdom against God and against justice."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> It is to be noted that neither the story of Godwin's nor that of Emma's ordeal, is known to the Saxon chronicler or to Florence of Worcester. The cause assigned for the Queen's ordeal is not even hinted at.

<sup>3</sup> The Saxon chronicle merely says—"Then on the second day of Easter he sat with the King at the feast; then suddenly sank he down by the footstool, deprived of speech and of all his power, and he was then carried in to the King's chamber, and they thought it would pass over; but it did not so; but he continued there speechless and powerless till the Thursday, and then resigned his life."

The religious ceremonies connected with this form of ordeal were sufficiently terrible. Here we have part of one prayer among many that preceded the trial. "O Lord Jesus Christ, Who art the living bread that descendest from heaven, . . . deign to bless this creature, bread and cheese, that it may search out the deceits and wiles of the enemy, . . . so that he may not be able to swallow the bread and cheese, through the closing up of his throat by Thy command; but let them at once be vomited forth, so that, being vanquished by the just judgment of Thy Divine Majesty, he may see his rash obstinacy confounded and brought to nought." After this, or some similar prayer, followed a solemn appeal to the man in this form—"I conjure thee, O man, by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by all the saints of God, . . . and by the dread Day of Judgment; so that, if thou art guilty of the crime laid to thy charge, either in act, in counsel, or in conscience, thou may not be able to eat this bread except with face swollen, with spittle and groans, with pains and tears, and may thy jaws be clenched and locked, and thou thyself vomit forth this food at the command of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . St. Nicolas, hear our prayers and help us before God."

We will quote one more prayer proper for the hot water ordeal—"Almighty and Eternal God, Who searchest the secrets of hearts, we humbly beseech Thee, if this man be guilty, and by the instigation of the devil, who has hardened his heart, presume to plunge his hand into this boiling water, let Thy just truth manifest his guilt; and in this act we beg Thee to show Thy truth, so that by the manifest scalding of his body he may repent of his sin, and while he blushes corporally, his soul may be saved in the last Judgment. And if he have tried to hide and conceal this sin by drinking ointment, or by external lotions, or by herbs or any other malpractice, may Thy holy right hand deign to foil the deceit."

Another form of ordeal was that by a red-hot bar of iron. The bar varied in weight from one to three pounds; the accused carried it for nine paces and then flung it down. His hand was at once wrapped up and sealed, and three days after was examined in the presence of both sides. If it showed no signs of injury, the man was declared innocent. A man of knightly station had to thrust his hand into an iron glove, and the same process of wrapping was gone through.

Closely connected with this last, and commonly used, was the ordeal of hot water; in which the accused man plunged his hand and brought out a stone which was suspended at a fixed depth. A scalding under these trying circumstances convicted him of guilt. For men of low degree we find the cold water system in use, and under the same forms which in later times became so famous in the testing of witches. According to rubrical directions given in the thirteenth century manuscript pontifical of the Monastery of Becca, the water was blessed and exorcised, the accuser and the accused took the usual oaths; then "let the hands of the accused be tied together under his thighs like a man entering a narrow place. Next let a rope to hold him be fastened round his waist, and a knot be made on the rope as high up as the longest hair of the man's head will reach, and in this way let him be gently lowered into the water, in order that the water may not be disturbed. If he sinks down to the knot, let him be pulled out as innocent, if not, let him be adjudged guilty." This method of testing is the more remarkable by reason of the prevailing view as to the presumption of guilt so long as the contrary was not established. One would think that an unhappy wretch in the painful position just mentioned, with his hands and feet bound, could only be saved from drowning by a merciful skill in pulling up the rope. These conditions of guilt, in the case of witches, are to be explained by the prevailing notion that a witch's body was lighter than it should naturally be.

Perhaps the most irrational of these various methods of testing the truth, was that by duel (*duellum, combat à outrance*). This form of trial, though not existing as a legally established institution among the English before the Conquest, was widely spread among, and often resorted to by, the other Teutonic peoples. The external procedure has been immortalized by Shakspeare in *Henry the Fourth*, and by Sir Walter Scott in *Ivanhoe*. The custom is curiously noted by Velleius Paterculus, who probably became acquainted with it when serving in the German campaigns of Tiberius. The wager of battle was legalized by Gundebald, King of the Burgundians (A.D. 500), afterwards by the codes of the Alemanni and the Longobards. Its use was somewhat restricted by the facts that the express permission of the sovereign was necessary, and that a pledge of considerable value, as reparation and compensation to the victor, was previously exacted. There are instances (though

they seem to be rare) of bishops and the inferior clergy appealing to this form of defending their innocence.

An instance of wager of battle being used to settle a dispute may be given which would be grotesque, were it not so painful. It affords a good illustration of the barbarity of the times, and of the divine patience of the Church in bearing with what might seem the desperate indocility of the nations to the Christian spirit. Alphonsus the Sixth of Castile, wanted to introduce the Gregorian rite into his kingdom. The old Gothic or Mozarabic had hitherto been the common liturgy. The change was proposed at a synod held at Burgos in 1077. Great opposition was however made, and as no agreement could be arrived at, wager of battle was had recourse to for a settlement of the dispute. Unfortunately, however, for the King's wishes, the Mozarabic champion won the victory, in consequence of which Alphonsus had to call in the direct interference of the Pope (Gregory the Seventh), who by his patient care brought the change about in 1080.

On this disputed subject of liturgy, we may give another amusing instance of trial by fire ordeal. Toledo had just been recovered from the Moors, and with a view of restoring the Faith in that city, the King of Castile determined on the introduction of the Roman rite (A.D. 1090). But, as in the previous case, so also in this, no arrangement could be come to. Accordingly, the ordeal was called into play to decide the question. A copy of both liturgies was thrown into the fire, and as the Mozarabic was unhurt while the Roman copy was burnt, or, as other versions of the story have it, leapt and sprang out when some firewood was flung upon the flames, the people of Toledo danced with joy at the victory of their cause. The King decided that both rites should be tolerated.

Each and all of these ordeals were surrounded by religious ceremonies, which by their solemnity and awe-inspiring character might force the guilty to a confession before he undertook the final trial. Consequently, the presence of ecclesiastical functionaries was always necessary and provided for by the laws regulating the manner of conducting the ordeals. The greatest care was also taken to frustrate any attempt on the part of the accused to escape the natural action of the water or iron bar on the person. These attempts were by no means unfrequent, as can be gathered from the frequent mention of them in the religious ceremonies, and were probably not confined to the

guilty. The hands or feet were on these occasions covered with grease or some other more elaborate preparation against the fire. Albertus Magnus, in his treatise *De Mirabilibus Mundi*, has the following specific, which some of our readers will doubtless be eager to test—"If you wish to carry fire in your hand without harm, put some lime in hot bean-water along with a little magranculis<sup>4</sup> and a little malviviscus.<sup>5</sup> Mix these well together, and then daub your hand with the decoction and dry it: then put fire upon it and no harm will result." Another recipe is the following—"A wonderful experiment to make people go through fire without injury. Take the juice of bismalva,<sup>6</sup> the white of egg, and the seed of psilum,<sup>7</sup> along with lime; pound and mix them. With the white of egg mix the juice of raphanum,<sup>8</sup> and with this compound daub your body and let it dry; afterwards daub again, and after this you can boldly bear fire without any harm." It will be noticed that Albertus Magnus suggests doubts of the efficacy of this last specific by enjoining a second coating of the plaster; doubtless it was the first more potent preservative which was used by the clerics, who, as some wise writers observe, always managed to go through a fire ordeal unscathed. The laws that regulated the ceremonies to be observed at the trial were very explicit on the point of collusion, and every precaution possible seems to have been taken against any chance of the end in view being defeated. The accused was forced to take a bath, to have his hands examined and then carefully wrapt up before the trial. In addition, as we have before noticed, religious ceremonies preceded the ordeal, with a view of deterring the guilty from a direct defiance of God and a contempt of His truth. Thus the laws of Athelstan say—"Let the accused go three nights before the trial to the priest, who shall confess him; let him feed on bread, salt, water, and herbs, and hear Mass on each of the three days; let him go to the Holy Communion on the day which is fixed for the ordeal, and swear before going to the ordeal, that by public law he is innocent of the crime charged against him. . . . (Here appears the worldly caution.) If the trial is to be by hot iron, let the accused pass three nights (as above) before the ordeal, and let his hand be examined," &c.

<sup>4-8</sup> As it would hardly be fair to supply a "royal road" to such knowledge, we leave to medical botanists the task of discovering these ingredients for themselves.



Trial by ordeal was coextensive with the human race. It would seem that no nation, of whose customs we know anything, did not make use of it. The Semitic, as well as the Aryan tribes were perfectly familiar with its application, and we possess the most explicit monuments to show how deeply it was ingrafted in the habits of mankind. In the Mosaic law<sup>9</sup> we find a divine ordinance establishing an ordeal in cases of matrimonial jealousy. This of course differs from all others in the essential feature that, as it was a trial appointed by God, so was there a divine sanction given to it that it should serve the end for which it was established. All others are mere human institutions, and as such are founded upon the assumption that God must obey the behests of His creatures antecedently to any manifestation of approval of the human institution. Moreover, the old Jewish ordeal did not, it will be observed, need any physical interposition of Divine Providence in favour of the innocent; it supposed that punishment would fall by a moral agency upon the guilty. The ordeal of the heathen presumptuously looked for a direct and physical agency in every case—in favour of the innocent, that natural causes should not produce their proper effects, while the occurrence of those natural effects was held to be an incontestable proof of guilt. The difference first mentioned, as is manifest, removes the Jewish ordeal at once from the category of a profane appeal to God to interfere directly in human affairs; it clears it of the character, common to all others, of being a tempting of God and making Him, against His divine will, responsible for injustice done to the guiltless.

Our readers will no doubt, have already returned to their school days, when they read with some surprise, how the guard of Polyneices' corpse is made by the great Athenian poet to say—

ἡμεν δ' ἔτοιμοι καὶ μύδρους αἶρειν χεροῖν  
καὶ πῦρ διέρπειν καὶ θεοῦς ὀρκωμοτεῖν,  
τὸ μῆτε δρᾶσαι, μῆτε τῷ ξυνειδέναι  
τὸ πρᾶγμα βουλευσάντι μῆτ' εἰργασμένῳ.

We have clear indications of the two forms of ordeal, that of walking over (or through) fire and that of carrying the iron bar, which, if, as is probable from the silence of authority on the subject, they were not in use at the time of Sophocles, had still been in existence at some more remote period of antiquity.

<sup>9</sup> Numbers v.

The scholiasts on this passage, quoting Callimachus, give us no information further than that these were among the customary tests of innocence and guilt.

The ordeal continued to be used in the Lower Empire, as may be seen from the Byzantine historians, *e.g.*, Phrantzes,<sup>10</sup> Pachymeres,<sup>11</sup> Acropolita,<sup>12</sup> Cantacuzenus.<sup>13</sup> We here see, however, from the instance of Michael Commenus, that the fire ordeal was never legalized at Constantinople.

Some authors quote the well-known passage from Virgil<sup>14</sup> as a proof that the ordeal was not unknown among the Latin tribes. But we can only learn from it that one of the rites in the worship of Apollo had been walking barefoot over hot coals—a sufficiently arduous proof of devotion, even though (heathen) priestcraft had discovered a preservation from the action of the fire. This passage at least affords no proof that the fire ordeal was in use as a species of trial.

What then was the attitude of the Church towards the ordeal? First, it is quite certain that individual bishops sanctioned the trial, and that some local synods drew up regulations establishing the mode of procedure, the various forms of ordeal, and the crimes which should be sent to that judgment. It is, in the second place, equally certain that the Church itself never approved, and that the Popes never sanctioned them. Thirdly, it is an historical fact that on all occasions both the Church, and the Popes at its head, condemned the ordeal on principle, forbade the clergy to have anything to do with the procedure, and, with regard to the wager of battle, excommunicated both principals and abettors. By their constant and renewed opposition to the system, they gradually brought over the minds of civil authorities to their view, and succeeded in rooting out an intrinsically vicious custom.

If the conduct of the individual bishops who sanctioned the ordeal shocks the reader of history, it is to be borne in mind that such scandal betrays but superficial and fundamentally false ideas as to human nature generally, and as to the position of bishops and the lower clergy in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. For these members of the Church have no guarantee of freedom from error or from the frailties of our common nature. Indeed, had they escaped contagion from the spirit that environed them round about, they might justly have been set up as extraordinary

<sup>10</sup> L. i., c. i.

<sup>11</sup> L. i., c. 12.

<sup>12</sup> C. 50.

<sup>13</sup> L. iii., c. 27.

<sup>14</sup> *Æneid*, xi., 717, seq.

intellectual phenomena ; had they successfully resisted the moral temptations to float down with the stream, on the supposition that they approved of the ordeal contrary to their better judgment, they would have afforded the world a brighter example of heroism than it has under the providence of God any right to expect. Many doubtless were moved to a material cooperation in the ordeal by the manifest impossibility of stopping it. And this may be safely assumed to have been the case with the local synods which regulated its application. This assumption is justified by the religious observances and fasts, by the confession and communion enjoined before the trial, as well as by the solemn warnings given to the accused<sup>15</sup> not to appeal to the judgment of God in an unholy cause. For all this we may reasonably suppose the guilty would not have much stomach.

If we now turn to the part the Popes themselves played in the matter, we shall see that there never was any dallying with an abuse of law, and no hesitation as to the way in which that abuse was to be done away with. Nicolas the First, Stephen the Fifth, Alexander the Second, Lucius the Third, Cœlestine the Third, Innocent the Third, Honorius the Third, all condemned the principle of the ordeal, laid its abettors under anathema, or otherwise strictly forbade its use. It was in vain to plead established usage or the weakness of judicial authority : customs which were radically vicious and heathen in their origin must give way to pure morality and to the spirit of Christianity, and these, as they were the only and sole foundations of social and political prosperity, so were they the best safeguards against the disorders and lawlessness of the times.

Thus we may first quote Innocent the Second, on a custom which had grown up between the English and Scottish bishops of settling their disputes by wager of battle—"A vicious custom, which might rather be called a corruption, inasmuch as it is utterly contrary to law and ecclesiastical propriety, has from olden times taken root in the Kingdoms of England and Scotland, and is even now by an abuse in existence and practice, viz., that if a bishop, abbot, or any cleric, be charged with any offence, on which wager of battle usually takes place among laymen, he who is so charged, however religious a man he may be, is forced personally to undergo that trial. We, therefore, utterly detesting that custom, as hateful to God and opposed to

<sup>15</sup> The accuser too was in certain cases forced to the ordeal.

the holy canons, strictly forbid, under pain of anathema, any one to act in this manner for the future."

Innocent the Third speaks in the following manner of a bishop who had sanctioned the hanging of a man who had unsuccessfully appealed to the ordeal of the hot bar (*ferrum candens*) on a charge of theft—"As the bishop did a grievous wrong, not only in the matter of the ordeal, but also in the death of the man, since he sanctioned it by his authority and presence, we adjudged him unworthy of the ministry of the altar. And as he could not fulfil the Episcopal charge without that ministry, we enjoined you . . . to call upon the bishop to resign, and otherwise we by our authority removed him from his see, and enjoined you to provide a successor by a canonical election." The Pope adds that, as the said bishop had gone to Rome, and urged that false information had been made against him, the case must be inquired into, and if the bishop's defence be found true, that he is to be reinstated, if not, the previous decision to be valid.

The same Pope writes on another occasion—"Although the common ordeals (*vulgaria judicia*), as those of cold water, or the hot iron, or wager of battle, are allowed by secular judges, the Church has not permitted them, since it is written, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Take care, therefore, with regard to the purgation of Reimbold, the bearer of this letter, who is accused of heresy, that you proceed in such a manner that this disease, which works its way like a cancer, be thoroughly cured by your careful watchfulness, so that neither an unjust trial crush him nor weak pity ruin him."

Before Innocent, Honorius the Third had said of the ordeal that it was absolutely forbidden, inasmuch as in it God seemed to be tempted. Six centuries before Honorius, Gregory the Great had noticed the custom to condemn it; in fact, it met with no mercy on the side of the Church, and through the Church it was in its various forms gradually discountenanced and abolished by secular princes.

By the middle of the fifteenth century, the ordeal had lost all appreciable hold on Christianized Europe.

R. C.

## Catholic Review.

### I.—LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

(On the Abyssinian Ordinations.)

DEAR FATHER COLERIDGE,—In reply to Canon Estcourt's remarks in the last MONTH, on my letter in the previous issue, concerning his interpretation of the decision of 1704, I desire to explain that I used the word "define" to indicate a final judicial settlement of a theological question, and of the sufficiency of a given sacramental form. Canon Estcourt had said, "It [the decision] had established the principle that the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, are sufficient as a form of ordination to the priesthood; it renders nugatory the argument raised by Talbot and Lewgar, that the distinctive order must be named in the form."<sup>1</sup> And again, "The effect of the decision is, that in a particular case, and under certain circumstances, the conferring of the priesthood with only the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, is to be considered valid."<sup>2</sup> To speak of a decision so interpreted as a definition, is, I believe, to use the word in its strict theological signification, but I would not have introduced it if I had noticed that Canon Estcourt was careful to avoid doing so.

In my former letter, I said it was evident from the *Controversia Coptica*, that Orders in Abyssinia were conferred according to the Alexandrian rite and in the Coptic tongue, and that up to the time when that treatise was written, "there was no reason to believe that the Abyssinian prelates had receded from or corrupted that rite so as to make the validity of Orders doubtful." Canon Estcourt questions all this, and he has an undoubted right to demand a proof of it. At the same time, I must say that the question of rite and language, in no way touches the main question between us. It was introduced by me not as an argument, but as an explanation. Some known rite was certainly presumed by the tribunal to have been used; but whether it was Coptic, or Ethiopic as Canon Estcourt seems to suggest, or any other, the *presumptio juris* is simply incompatible with his interpretation of the decree. The *postulatum* exhibits a certain deviation from a presumed standard—the matter and form, which are the essential parts of the rite. The decision asserts that notwithstanding such deviation, that which is essential is present, and the sacrament is valid. Canon Estcourt understands that the deviation itself contains all that is essential to its

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 191, 192.

<sup>2</sup> P. 194.

validity. In order that I may make this clear, and that I may at the same time dispose of the question of rite, I will ask permission to leave the *Controversia* of Assemani for the present.

The second paragraph of the decision in question, speaking of the admission to the exercise of Orders of those who according to the first paragraph are validly ordained, runs as follows—"If a priest should say absolutely, that he was ordained with imposition of hands and pronouncement of the form, and if there be no other impediment, the missionary, after giving him a dispensation from irregularity, and absolution from excommunication, may admit him to the exercise of his Orders *according to the rite, approved and expurgated, in which he was ordained.*" The Holy Office then did not suppose that the Abyssinians were ordained "with only the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,*" but presumed that some rite, and that "an approved rite," had been followed.

Two things are included in the approval of a rite. First, its being declared simply a valid rite, no matter by whom used. Secondly, in addition to this, its use being permitted to those of the Catholic communion, yet the declaration of validity without approval secures for the rite all the *præsumptiones juris*. We have a good instance of this in the Anglican rite of baptism. It is known to be valid, though its use is prohibited to us. As far as canonical presumptions are concerned, there is no difference between it and an approved rite. Thus converts from Anglicanism who have had only probable grounds to doubt of the validity of their baptism, have invariably been held by the Holy Office to all the canonical effects of an undoubted baptism, such as absolution in *utroque foro*, and the bond of matrimony where it would, in case of an invalid baptism, be null or rescindible. No doubt there are often errors of fact in such decisions, but when the truth cannot be clearly ascertained, all legal codes, civil and ecclesiastical, are framed so that judgment will rest upon well defined presumptions.

In the case of the Abyssinian Orders, it is clear the approval of the rite was complete, as the converts were permitted to continue in its exercise. This will help us in our inquiry, for the approved rites of Oriental Catholics can easily be ascertained.

Benedict the Fourteenth, in an Encyclical directed to the Oriental bishops in the year 1755, and speaking of a decree of Propaganda dated 1702, enjoining upon all the retention of the approved rites of their own nation, says, "Which decree regards the Catholics of the Oriental Church and their rites approved by the Holy See. It is known to all that the Oriental Churches consist of four rites, viz., Greek, Armenian, Syrian, and Coptic."<sup>3</sup> Such was the state of things at the opening of the eighteenth century, two years before the decision now in question was given. The Pope then goes on to relate how these several rites had been approved and expurgated by his predecessors. It may be useful to say a word as to how this was brought about.

<sup>3</sup> *Bullarium Pont. S. C. de Propaganda Fidei*, tom. i., p. 234.



In the sixteenth, and the early part of the seventeenth centuries, many theologians, resting chiefly on mistaken interpretations of utterances from Rome, rejected as invalid all the Oriental ordinations, on the ground that the delivery of the instruments, which they held to be essential, was omitted. And, in deference to this view, converts from the separate communities were ordained again conditionally. In consequence of this, shortly before the middle of the seventeenth century, Urban the Eighth appointed a commission or congregation to examine the question of Greek Orders, under which term all the Oriental rites were understood to be included; and to this congregation he summoned Morinus, Allatius, and Holstenius, probably the three best Oriental scholars in Europe at the time. The result of the researches and labours of this congregation was, that the new theory was completely and utterly exploded, as far as the schools and the Roman Curia were concerned, and that the substantial identity of all the great rites was vindicated once for all. These rites had been long before virtually acknowledged at the Council of Florence, but now they received more signal approbation, and not only were converts permitted to retain their own rite, but were strictly forbidden to alter it for any other. Morinus, in the preface to a work which had its origin in the part he had taken in this congregation, says—"I have found also, with much labour, the Eastern ordinations, of the Syrians, namely, the Maronites, who are Catholics, and inhabit Mount Libanus; of the Nestorians, who, dispersed throughout Syria, Babylon, Persia, and the extreme Indies, profess the name and religion of Christians; and of the Jacobites, of whom there is not only a large number in Syria, but also in Egypt and Ethiopia on both sides of the equator, and are wide-spread in the torrid region." He later adds—"I would here, in passing, warn the reader that the ordinations of these schismatics have been approved by the Roman Church, and are daily being approved."<sup>4</sup>

Morinus gives, in their due place, two ordinals for the Jacobites; one Syriac for the Asiatic Jacobites, and the other Coptic for the Egyptian and Abyssinian Jacobites. The latter is that which Kircher translated from the Coptic language and text, and which is given by Assemani in the *Controversia Coptica*. Morinus says, "The difference between this rite and the preceding (the Syriac) is this, that the former is that of the Jacobites dispersed throughout Syria, Assyria, Persia, and the whole East; but this (the Coptic) of the Jacobites who inhabit Egypt and both Ethiopias."<sup>5</sup> I think I may conclude from this, that up to the time of Morinus' publication (1655) this was the only ordinal approved of for the Abyssinians. Before I have done with Morinus, I may as well observe that he distinctly undertakes to prove that the matter and form of Holy Orders are permanent and virtually identical in all the approved rites.<sup>6</sup> Also, that the imposition of hands, with the words, *Accipe*

<sup>4</sup> *Commentarius in Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinibus*, Præf.

<sup>5</sup> P. 41.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

*Spiritus Sanctum*, are not this matter and form.<sup>7</sup> After the decision of 1704 was published and made known to theologians, Renaudot<sup>8</sup> and Lequien,<sup>9</sup> the two greatest Oriental Catholic scholars of their time, taught the same doctrine, and require for the validity of the sacrament that the form should contain express mention of the order conferred. I now come to the *Controversia Coptica*.

This treatise was written by order of Propaganda to set at rest some lingering difficulties that remained with regard to the recognition of Coptic ordinations. The writer was desired to furnish a report regarding "the validity of the form used by the heretical Coptic bishops in the administration of Holy Orders."<sup>10</sup> He begins his work by telling us who the Copts are. "The Copts are the Christians of the patriarchate of Alexandria, inhabiting Egypt and the Thebaid, followers of the errors of Dioscorus, formerly Patriarch of Alexandria, and deposed for the Eutychian heresy by the Council of Chalcedon. They extend also to Ethiopia, or Abyssinia, to which, as subject to the patriarchal see of Alexandria, the Coptic Patriarch is accustomed to send a metropolitan of the same rite and nation."<sup>11</sup> In a fragment of another work, in which he does not speak, as here, merely of Orders, but of the Oriental Christian nations, which he enumerates, he says, "The sixth [nation] is that of the Copts or Egyptians, inhabiting the provinces of Egypt. They are followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus, and observe the rites of the ancient Alexandrian Church, in the Coptic or Egyptian tongue however, and for the psalter they use the Arabic. Their Patriarch lives at Grand Cairo, his jurisdiction extending to Ethiopia, on account of which the Abyssinian or Ethiopian Christians embrace the dogmas and rites of the Copts, although in their *Divine Offices* they make use of the Ethiopic and not of the Coptic tongue."<sup>12</sup> I must ask attention to the two distinct significations that are here attached to the word "Coptic." In the first quotation the word denotes the Coptic or Alexandrian Church, and includes the Abyssinians; in the latter it denotes the nation, and excludes them. Again, it must be observed that "the Divine Offices" signify the liturgy, or at most the sacerdotal offices. The term is not usually understood to mean the episcopal offices. We all know that the liturgy of St. Basil and several other liturgies are used by the Abyssinian priests in the old Ethiopic tongue. I doubt whether any of them has ever been approved, as the Abyssinian students in Rome follow the same rite as those of the Coptic nation; at all events, as there are no bishops of the Abyssinian nation, the quotation cannot apply to the ordinal even if it were approved, which it certainly is not.

So far, then, we have ascertained that the Abyssinian priests belong to the Coptic or Alexandrian Church, that they use the Coptic rite, that

<sup>7</sup> *Exercit.*, vii., c. vi.

<sup>8</sup> *Memoire*. Paris, 1730, p. 279, et seq.

<sup>9</sup> *Nullité des Ordinations Anglicaines*. Paris, 1730, ii., p. 64, et seq.

<sup>10</sup> Mai, *Scriptorum Veterum*, t. v., p. 171.

<sup>11</sup> P. 172.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 238.

their only bishop, the Abuna, is by rite and nation a Copt.<sup>13</sup> It will appear, I think, from this that Assemani, who undertook to treat of "the validity of the form used by the heretical Coptic bishops," does something more than touch incidentally the subject of Abyssinian Orders in this treatise, which is the most that Canon Estcourt will admit. It is surely the proper subject-matter of his investigations, and we shall see that he treats it as such, directly and *ex professo*.

He begins the argumentative portion of his treatise by laying down a rule taken from the practice of the Roman Curia, that "the only manner of being able to judge of the validity of a sacrament is through a knowledge of the rituals."<sup>14</sup> He then describes the manuscripts to which he desires to refer in his inquiry as to the validity of the forms used by Coptic bishops, and he selects that translated by Kircher and given by Morinus.

He next gives a chapter<sup>15</sup> to the examination of "the number of Orders among the Copts and other Orientals." He makes no express mention of the Abyssinians in this chapter, but says, "From the pontificals given above we gather that the ordinations, consecrations, and benedictions among the Copts are ten in number," &c. However, in the seventh chapter there is a passage which bears upon this. Commenting on the evidence of Tecla Maria, he says, "The Orders of ostiarius and acolyte are included in the subdiaconate, and are not distinct Orders amongst all the Orientals, Greeks, Syrians, Egyptians, and Abyssinians, as is stated above." This reference takes us to the chapter on the number of Orders. In it, besides the Greek and Syriac, he only speaks of the Coptic rite, the Coptic Orders, and only refers to the Coptic pontifical. Yet he says that a condition of Abyssinian Orders is proved by this. From which it is very clear that in this treatise the word "Coptic," when applied to a rite or to Orders is co-extensive in meaning with the words Copt and Abyssinian when applied to the people; and moreover that he desires to be understood to include the Abyssinian when he speaks of the Coptic ordinal or ordinations. It is quite true that immediately after the passage last quoted he speaks of what is found "in the Coptic rite and in all the other Oriental rites, Greek, Syrian, and Abyssinian." All we can gather from this is, that the Abyssinian rite or ordinal is not Coptic; not the ordinal, whose validity he has undertaken to defend, as that used by the Coptic Archbishop of Abyssinia. I shall speak later of this Abyssinian rite.

In the third chapter he says, "It appears clearly from the councils, the fathers, and the pontificals, what the matter and form of Orders is, among the Orientals, as well Greeks as Syrians, Copts, and Abyssinians,

<sup>13</sup> I have not deemed it necessary to refer to my authorities for these statements, as they are to be found in every treatise *De Patriarcha Alexandrino*, as well as in the letters of later missionaries. For four hundred years the only Jacobite bishop in Abyssinia has been elected, consecrated, and appointed by the Patriarch.

<sup>14</sup> P. 186.

<sup>15</sup> C. ii.

viz., the imposition of the bishop's hands, and the prayer which is contemporaneously recited by him over the *ordinandus*." He proceeds to demonstrate this proposition, but as far as the Abyssinians are concerned, he does so without a single reference to the Ethiopic rite, referring solely to the Coptic pontifical. In the fourth chapter he fixes on the particular imposition of hands and the particular prayers which constitute the matter and form of the several Orders. He does so referring only to the Coptic rite, and so on from point to point till the end of the treatise.

The objections he deals with on the part of Latin theologians are the same as had long ago been answered by Morinus and others; he gives, however, special consideration to the fact that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the missionaries had authority to reiterate the ordinations of Abyssinian priests and deacons. He concludes that he has theologically shown "that the validity of the form which the Coptic bishops use in the Alexandrian Church is undoubted." He shows further, that these orders had been approved of by successive Popes. "And the Popes," he continues, "having granted to the Abyssinian nation, which is of the same rite as the Copts, the Church and Hospital of St. Stephen, protomartyr, near the sacred Vatican Basilica, these monks [Andrew and Joseph, Coptic monks], exercised freely their Holy Orders in that church, as at the present time do the Coptic monks."<sup>16</sup> "But," he continues in the next paragraph, "we cannot dissimulate that in the sixteenth and following century the patriarch and the fathers of the Society of Jesus, in Ethiopia, reiterated the ordinations of Abyssinian priests and deacons."<sup>17</sup> This is the practical difficulty he has to meet, notwithstanding the theoretical establishment of his thesis concerning the validity of the Coptic rite. How would this be a difficulty if the Abyssinians were ordained by any other than the Coptic rite? If the Ethiopian rite had been used, how could he have introduced this matter as he does? Having introduced it, however, he deals with it, and having disposed of it, he claims to have vindicated the Coptic ordinations from every shadow of doubt.<sup>18</sup> I must, however, speak of the line of argument he adopts with regard to this practical difficulty.

The missionaries were not accustomed to state the grounds of their objections. But in 1594, the reigning Pontiff directed that Tecla Maria, an Abyssinian monk, should be examined on the way in which he had been ordained. "From this examination," says Assemani, "we clearly gather that the motive of doubting of the validity of the Ethiopian and Coptic ordinations, has been the defect in the delivery of the instruments in the ordination, believed by modern theologians to be necessary matter even in a rite of the Oriental Church." He proceeds to prove this. The idea of quoting the evidence of this Tecla to point out the nature of the difficulty felt in 1704, was not mine. But Assemani, who knew that Propaganda required rather an exposition

<sup>16</sup> C. vii., p. 224.<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>18</sup> C. viii., p. 228.

of the state of the whole question for their guidance in the year 1731, than a history of the past, takes this one case as illustrating the whole difficulty from beginning to end, and as comprising all the difficulties that had been represented by the missionaries. His method might be objectionable if followed in a historical or controversial work; but his treatise was a private document, furnished to men with whom the affairs of Abyssinia were perfectly familiar. The drift of his argument, if argument it can be called, was to show that there was no practical doubt to counteract the theoretical certainty of Coptic Orders. His conclusions are for his own time, and not for the past. "The validity of the form used by the Coptic bishops is undoubted."<sup>19</sup> "As far as the matter and form are concerned, it has been seen already that in the Coptic rite they are duly observed, and that they consist in the imposition of the bishop's hands and in the prayer suitable to the Order;"<sup>20</sup> and he ends by saying, "There is nothing, therefore, to oppose to the validity of the Coptic ordinations, neither as regards the minister, nor as regards the matter and form: that which I undertook to prove, submitting all to the censure of this holy tribunal."<sup>21</sup> It strikes me that this language would simply be unaccountable, if it were at that time known in Rome that the Coptic Archbishop of Abyssinia had thrown aside this Alexandrian rite, or deviated from it, so that the Abyssinian Orders should be rendered doubtful. This is what I desired to make clear in my former letter to the MONTH, relying on the great authority of Assemani and the high value set on this treatise, that up to his own time the missionaries of Abyssinia had presented no difficulty worthy of notice beyond what he speaks of. He does not speak of each successive case, but examines one as an instance of the rest, and as containing their substance. In general he speaks of all as belonging to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and he naturally would include among them a case decided in the early part of the year 1704, which probably took some years to reach the Holy Office.

Assemani notices some discrepancies between the evidence of Tecla Maria and that which is prescribed in the Coptic and, indeed, in every other rite. He tries to account for them by a series of disjunctive hypotheses, such as are very common in historical arguments. "It appears clear," he says, "that either Tecla Maria or the Coptic archbishops who ordained him were but little practised in the Coptic rite, or had altered it in some part, or else that Tecla Maria did not well recollect the things done in his ordination, because in the Coptic rite the Orders are not such as Tecla Maria mentioned, either in number or order."<sup>22</sup> From these and other similar remarks of Assemani, already in part quoted, Canon Estcourt observes "that he cannot think Tecla Maria's evidence of any weight in showing that the Alexandrian ordinal was used in Abyssinia in 1544, or that if it were, 'the Abyssinian prelates had not receded from or corrupted that rite before the year 1731.'" The quotation included in this extract is from my letter in the

<sup>19</sup> P. 224.<sup>20</sup> P. 235.<sup>21</sup> P. 237.<sup>22</sup> P. 277.

MONTH. The whole passage, as previously quoted by Canon Estcourt, is as follows—"It (the *Controversia*) makes it quite clear that the ordinations were administered in the Coptic language, according to the Alexandrian ordinal, and that up to 1731 *there was no reason to believe that the Abyssinian prelates had receded from or corrupted that rite so as to make the validity of Orders doubtful.*" I must observe that I never referred for proof to the evidence of Tecla Maria on any of those points, though I might well have done so. I referred the reader to his examination in the third and following paragraph of the seventh chapter, as containing the history of his case, a declaration of the difficulties felt by the missionaries, the questions put to him, his answers, and all the comments of Assemani on the whole proceeding. I referred to this merely as regards the question of rite and language. I never denied that the rite had been altered, except so as to invalidate the sacrament, and never referred to this part of the *Controversia* with regard to their having been substantially retained till 1731.

Assemani tells us distinctly that the discrepancy between Tecla's narrative and the prescribed rite can only be accounted for by his, or the archbishops, not being practised (*poco pratici*) in the Coptic rite, or that they had altered it, or that he had forgotten the things done in his ordination. I really thought this would have been sufficient to satisfy my readers that Assemani took for granted that the Coptic, that is the Alexandrian, rite had been used. Else how could he account for the variation between the narrative and the rite by the suggestion of blunders on the part of the Coptic archbishops, or how could they have in part altered a rite that they did not use? That the alteration was not such as to render the Orders doubtful in that particular case is, I think, manifest enough. That, according to Assemani, the Orders remained valid to his own time, I have shown in its proper place.

Tecla tells us, in two places, that the prayers were recited by the Coptic archbishops in the Egyptian tongue. Canon Estcourt thinks that this is contradicted by Assemani, who says in another work that the Abyssinians use the Ethiopian tongue in their *Sacred Offices*. I cannot see how one testimony opposes the other. Naturally the Abyssinians use Ethiopic, the Egyptians Coptic, and the ordinal of a bishop is very different from the missal of a priest. In the last century the Abunas were frequently ignorant of Abyssinian, and Alvarez tells us that at an ordination he witnessed, the Abuna gave the instruction to the *ordinandi* in Arabic. I have never heard of bishops ordaining in any other language than that of the rite they use. I have failed to discover in any writer whom I have consulted, the remotest hint of an Ethiopic version being made use of. I speak of Catholic writers, because I know Ludolf and Courayer spoke of the fragments published by the former, or as if they were in actual use. But the bad faith and ignorance of ecclesiastical affairs exhibited by Ludolf, who is the only witness referred to, deprive him of any



weight in a matter like this.<sup>23</sup> It is true that Assemani suggests as one of the possible explanations he offers, that Tecla may not have remembered well what had taken place at his ordination, but he does not imply, nor has he any grounds for saying, that Tecla did not remember well. He does not enumerate among the matters requiring explanation the use of the Coptic tongue. On this point he accepts the testimony, or rather passes it over, as it must have been a matter of public notoriety. Canon Estcourt suggests that Tecla may have mistaken the ancient Ethiopic for Coptic, as both were unknown to him. That the Coptic was unknown to him he tells us himself; but he could hardly be ignorant of Ethiopic, which, as a priest, he constantly used in the sacred offices.

Besides, if we accept the evidence of Tecla as to the bishops having changed the rite in some particulars, we cannot impeach his memory on the sole ground that he has made those statements. We may choose either member of a disjunctive hypothesis, but we cannot build upon both at the same time. Tecla was a witness whose evidence has been deemed of sufficient gravity to be quoted by the most eminent writers on other matters of Abyssinian rite,<sup>24</sup> and Le Grand confirms the testimony of Alvarez on the points here in question by his authority. It may not be out of place to give here the conclusion Le Grand arrives at as to the validity of Abyssinian Orders in his time (his *Dissertation on the Abyssinian Sacraments* were published in 1728) and his reasons for believing them to be valid. "The Abyssinians," he says, "no less than the Copts and Greeks, give nearly the same definition of ordination as we do; agreeing that it is a sacred sign, accompanied with many solemn ceremonies, with which the bishop, by the imposition of hands, confers on the persons ordained a portion of grace convenient for the ecclesiastical office to which they are raised. They believe with us that the episcopacy, the priesthood, and the diaconship, were instituted by Jesus Christ, and delivered down to us by the Apostles and their successors; that this sacrament is necessary for supplying the Church with ministers; that a man not ordained according to that institution cannot consecrate the Eucharist or perform any office of a priest." And again, "Whatever the missionaries, and after them, Father Batthasar Tellez, may say, there is no denying the validity of the Orders conferred by the Abuna according to the practice of the Eastern Christians."

With regard to the Ethiopic version given by Ludolf, I think it is already pretty clear that it has never been approved of, and therefore cannot be referred to in the decision of 1704, that it is not used by the Coptic Abuna, and must therefore have been obsolete for at least four hundred years. It is found together with the rite for episcopal consecration, which has certainly not been used in Abyssinia since

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Renaudot, *Liturgie Orientales*. Paris, 1716, p. 523.

<sup>24</sup> Le Grand, *Dissertation on Extreme Unction*, etc. London, 1789, p. 363. These Dissertations were translated by Dr. Johnson, and are found at the end of Lobos' *Voyage to Abyssinia*.

the Abyssinian bishoprics ceased to exist. The Abyssinian succession has long since died out, and their only bishop is consecrated by the Patriarch in Cairo.<sup>25</sup> I cannot but suspect that it was never used as a form of ordination even by Abyssinian bishops, but that it is a relic of that *ritus umbratilis* which the presbyter Kings seem to have fashioned for themselves at the time that Abyssinia was wholly destitute of priests and bishops alike. I cannot otherwise account for the careful omission of every expression indicative of the giving of a sacrament, and the use of which, by any other than a consecrating bishop, would involve the dreaded crime of sacrilege.

In defining the form used in the Coptic rite, Assemani says, "The bishop, having recited with his face towards the altar, the common prayer, *Quæso, Domine*, turns to the *ordinandus* and places his right hand on his head, saying the form of ordination, *Dominator Dominus*, and this ended, he proceeds, turned towards the altar, with the common prayer, *Respice Domine*."<sup>26</sup> From this form, or prayer, so defined, I gave in my former letter a series of expressions which I called "crucial," in the sense that they were distinctive of a sacramental form. As I have just indicated, they are all excised from the Ethiopic form, or changed into common terms. For this reason I said that the Ethiopic forms were mutilated copies of the Coptic. On this Canon Estcourt comments as follows—"This quotation [the series of crucial expressions] is taken from two different prayers given both by Assemani and Morinus as the Coptic rite of ordaining a priest. But I cannot find any indication from Assemani that the rite as containing both these prayers was used in Abyssinia. The first of the two prayers, as well as the 'mutilated copies' of it, appear to be different versions of the prayer in the Apostolic Constitutions. The three may be seen in juxtaposition. Assemani mentions the Constitutions as containing this prayer, referring to the copy in Morinus. The second prayer, which contain the words, 'Ut opera sacerdotis super populum tuum perficiat,' does not seem to have found its way into Abyssinia at all."<sup>27</sup>

I have been much puzzled by these remarks of Canon Estcourt, and cannot help thinking that he has made some mistake. All the expressions he has quoted from me are taken from what Assemani defines to be the "form" (not the "rite") of Holy Orders, the prayer between the two common prayers, *Quæso* and *Respice*. This form begins with the solemn opening and ends with the solemn termination common to nearly all the Coptic prayers. There is no interruption in the action, sense, or text, except that about midway the deacon says "orate." Assemani makes no distinction whatever between these "two different prayers," but says in the place referred to by Canon Estcourt—"The form is the prayer which commences in the ordination of lector, *Deus magne*, etc. . . . Of the priest, *Dominator Domine Deus*, etc. . . . These prayers, in which consists the form of Coptic ordinations, are all in the most ancient rite of ordinations attributed

<sup>25</sup> P. 222.<sup>26</sup> Renaudot, *De Patriarcha Alexandrino*, n. cviii.<sup>27</sup> P. 223.

to St. Clement, and given in the *Book of Apostolic Constitutions*, in Morinus." Turning to Morinus, to the place referred to, we find no distinction between the two different prayers, but the whole form as it is in Assemani, without any indication of division or interruption. Lastly, turning to the Ethiopian forms as given by Canon Estcourt, and collated with the principal parts of the Coptic and Clementine forms, we find that the Ethiopian forms are drawn from what Canon Estcourt calls the second as well as the first prayer.

My suggestion that the two forms, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, and *Reple eum Spiritu Sancto*, are translations of the same Coptic text, was not put forward as susceptible of proof, but as a reasonable hypothesis. My reasons for having made it are these—(1) The two forms are sacramentally equivalent and verbally almost identical, the only difference being that one is addressed to God, the other to the *ordinandus*. (2) There has always been a difficulty among Orientalists about the translation of the Coptic invocation of the Holy Ghost, and Lequien suggests, when speaking of the Ethiopian form, that the difference between it and the Coptic is due to the ignorance of the Ethiopians.<sup>28</sup> (3) As this form is not taken from any ordinal, the missionaries who speak of it must have obtained it from their Jacobite converts. Thus translated into Abyssinian first, and then Latin, the slight difference between the two forms might easily have disappeared.<sup>29</sup> The words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, may however have slipped into the ordinal from the Coptic rite of Confirmation, in which they are found together with insufflation; or possibly from the Arabic notes in the ordinal which frequently compendiate or illustrate with parallel invocations the sense of the prescribed prayers.

But all this has really very little to say to the original question between me and Canon Estcourt concerning the decision of the Holy Office. The only direct objection to my arguments I can find in his letter, is, that he has learnt that the opinion of the officials of Propaganda and of Father Perrone are on his side. I do not question, nor do I desire to disguise the importance of this allegation. It surprised me much, but I must accept it. Nevertheless, every one will see how difficult it is for me to gauge the limits of assent, or fix the degree of authority thus obtained for Canon Estcourt's theory.

His interpretation, to leave its other difficulties aside, seems to bring the Holy Office into collision with the prevalent language of theology both before and after the decision. Even if, by a questionable possibility, the highest authorities were aware of that language being incorrect, it would be unprecedented to attempt to correct it by a decision which according to all the established rules of interpretation would be as inefficacious as this is.

<sup>28</sup> *Nullius*, t. i., pp. 94, 95.

<sup>29</sup> Exactly the same substitution took place in the ordination of deacons in the Latin Church.

Finally, I fully accept all that Mgr. Bel has told us about Abyssinia. I fear it is too true, that theory and practice are very different things, and that now, beyond all question, their ordinations are invalid. It is admitted that for the last century or more, things have been going from bad to worse. But I spoke of a century and a half ago. I think I have shown that in the earlier years of last century, Rome had reason to presume that the Coptic rite had been, in substance at least, observed by the Coptic Archbishop of Abyssinia. I cannot admit that in 1704 the whole rite of Abyssinian ordinations consisted merely in the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, and the imposition of hands, when the decision of the Holy Office directs, that "priests ordained with the imposition of hands and pronouncement of the form, as in the case, were to be admitted to the exercise of their Orders according to the rite, approved and expurgated, in which they were ordained." We shall be glad to receive fresh information, or to obtain new documents from Abyssinia. They may possibly correct our notions concerning the rite of ordinations which has long been in use there, though this I do not expect, but they cannot change the fact that between the time of Morinus and Assemani, the Coptic ordinal was the approved rite of that Church.

I remain faithfully yours,

J. JONES.

---

## II.—SELECTIONS FROM FOREIGN CATHOLIC PERIODICALS.

### *The Civiltà Cattolica on the Vindiciæ Alphonsianæ and the Vindiciæ Ballerinianæ.*<sup>1</sup>

Our readers are doubtless aware that by a General Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, published on the 23rd March, 1871, the Holy Father conferred on St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, Bishop and Confessor, Founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, the title of *Doctor of the Universal Church*, a title of most eminent distinction, which has not been conferred during nineteen centuries on as many saints. In this, as in former cases, the declaration gave a legal sanction to what had long since existed *de facto*. Even before the close of his life-long labours, he was a teacher of the Church, of ever-increasing influence. His *Moral Theology* has at length become the text-book of Catholic schools. The bull of his canonization contains the record of a special authorization of his now classical work. Still, that nothing might be wanting for the sainted prelate to take rank with Athanasius, Augustine, and Chrysostom, his works, as a preliminary step to his promotion to so eminent a grade, were submitted anew to a

<sup>1</sup> The ensuing pages are condensed from an article lately published in the above-named Review, the immediate subject of which is the work in defence of Father Ballerini lately published in Belgium, under the name *Vindiciæ Ballerinianæ*.

searching and lengthened examination. The procedure followed on this occasion was the same as that which is known to precede the beatification and canonization of the servants of God. A Promoter of the Faith was appointed to oppose *ex officio* the claims of the saint to the new title, and entering conscientiously into the spirit of his position, he raked together all imaginable objections. Of these, many were mere quibbles and transparent sophisms, but the strongest weapons in his armoury were some thirty passages extracted from Father Ballerini's notes on the two volumes of Gury's *Compendium of Moral Theology*, wherein the learned annotator differs from the conclusions of St. Alphonsus.

These were duly urged as so many blemishes on the doctrine of the saint and as a possible plea in bar of his claims to the "Doctorate." On the other hand, the *ex officio* defender of the cause, together with some Redemptorist theologians, replied to these objections which, at most, tended to show that Father Ballerini, who agrees with St. Alphonsus on thousands of points where opinions are divergent, but rejects his solutions in some relatively few instances.

These replies, which have since been amplified and perfected, constitute the bulk of the *Vindiciæ Alphonsianæ*; or, "Vindication of the moral teaching of St. Alphonsus from the many strictures of Father Antonio Ballerini, S.J.," published by the Propaganda Press in the early part of last year.

The far-famed professor, who is thus made to bear the brunt of the battle, needs no introduction to our theological readers. But it may be useful to others to state that he acquired a world-wide reputation by his works and the style of his teaching while he held during many years the Chair of Moral Theology in the Roman College. Now, the staple of his lectures has ever been the moral theology of St. Alphonsus, for a long time his only text-book, which he developed to his audience with that depth of science he had acquired by his unwearying study of that and other approved authorities in this branch of ecclesiastical teaching. If, in 1866, he changed his text-book, it was not on account of any diminution of his regard for the holy doctor, as he must now be called, but because Gury's *Compendium*, besides its brevity and fidelity to the doctrine of St. Alphonsus, from which it but very rarely dissents, had the further advantage of a more appropriate arrangement of the series of the different treatises. Father Ballerini published a new edition of this *Compendium*, to which he added copious notes, the fruit of his studies, and the most valuable part of his lectures during the many years he has devoted to teaching.

We have already mentioned the use made of these annotations by the Promoter of the Faith, but the *Vindiciæ* turn the tables on Father Ballerini, and ground on these same notes, charges of no slight gravity. The indictment contains the following counts: the Roman professor has tried to subvert the theological system of St. Alphonsus, and of other eminent divines; he misconstrues the writings of theologians and the

pronouncements of ecclesiastical authority ; he reasons in utter defiance of logical rules ; and what is worse than all, he takes delight in insulting St. Alphonsus and other illustrious doctors, not sparing the luminaries even of his own order ; he makes but little account of Pontifical authority.

To the charge of systematic opposition to the principles and teaching of St. Alphonsus we may oppose the unanimous witness of his numerous hearers during the seventeen years and more that he has taught moral theology ; they can testify that, on the whole, his views coincided with those of the saint. At times, it is true, with that frank simplicity which is one of his characteristics, he would differ from the conclusions of his master and guide, but the tone of his teaching was ever instinct with a deep veneration for the holy doctor, with which too he inspired those who came under his tuition. His published works may also be appealed to as rebutting this groundless charge. To this may be added that Father Ballerini's teaching was no hole and corner affair. Students grouped round his chair from most of the colleges and many of the religious houses in Rome. Anything savouring of habitual depreciation of St. Alphonsus could not but have attracted notice, and drawn upon him complaint and animadversion. Assuredly the Roman College was not the place where a professor could air his idiosyncrasies undisturbed. The few passages which occur, here and there, in his voluminous annotations cannot reasonably be taken to argue an animus wholly at variance with the tenor of his public career. But with regard to these extracts which are put forward as the *corpus delicti*, we seriously question whether Father Ballerini has had fair measures dealt to him, when passages, which require to be read with their context, are incompletely quoted, or interpreted in a sense foreign to the mind of the author. As the Latin poet is our warrant for asserting that even the "Good Homer sometimes nods," it may, we think, be permitted to state that St. Alphonsus was occasionally unlucky in his quotations, that he quoted wrongly, or missed the real drift of the quotation, without incurring thereby an accusation of want of reverence. In a word, with the fullest respect for the sentiments of filial veneration which would shield from aspersion and depreciation a sainted and cherished memory, we fail to see what purpose can be served by a cento of extracts made to coalesce into a whole never contemplated by the mind of the author, by uniting, as it were, in one picture, to the exclusion of aught else, the several passages wherein he signalizes error or oversight on the part of the saint, who most assuredly never laid claim to exemption from the usual shortcomings attendant on the imperfection of our mental powers.

There remains one charge which we may not lightly dismiss, as, under the circumstances, it involves far more than the private character of Father Ballerini. It is that which implies his failing in due reverence to the Apostolic See. As the history of the Society and the tone of its institutions abundantly prove, it has ever been most earnest in



inspiring its members, and all who in any way come under its influence, with ardent love for the Church, and affectionate loyalty to the Supreme Pastor on earth. Nothing can be more foreign to the spirit it inculcates than a grudging, half-hearted obedience to his mandates. The Holy See, we know, has on three different occasions signified its approval of the doctrine of St. Alphonsus, and we are fully agreed with the authors of the *Vindiciæ*,<sup>2</sup> that to reject a conclusion of his as false, would be to fail in reverence to the Apostolic Chair. But then this applies to one who has but his own private views to oppose to the authority of the saint, not to the theologian who grounds his dissent on the reasons and acknowledged authority of approved authors.

But we may further inquire into the real import of these repeated approbations. According to the compilers of the *Acta quæ apud S. Sedem geruntur*, in judgments of this description emanating from the Holy See, the doctrine is considered not *absolutely* and in itself, but *relatively*, or so far forth as it might have barred canonization, or the conferring, as in this case, the title of doctor. In other words, such approbation is not necessarily *positive* and *intrinsic*, but rather *negative*, and so to speak, *extrinsic*. This is, of course, equivalent to an implied positive approval, and in this present case, the terms of commendation wherewith the doctrine of St. Alphonsus is mentioned in the bull of his canonization, and still more in the recent brief of July 7th, 1871, amount to a positive and express, or explicit approval. Yet as all are agreed, such approval is neither *particular* nor *exclusive*. It is not *particular*, in that it decides nothing as to the objective truth or the degrees of probability attaching to each of the author's published opinions, neither is it *exclusive*, in that it diminishes in nought the authority acquired by the contrary opinions of other approved divines.

We, therefore, regard as excessive the claim set up for St. Alphonsus by the authors of the *Vindiciæ*, to wit, that the reverence due to the holy doctor and to the Apostolic See requires that none save a doctor beyond all exception—and there is none such—should venture to reject as false any one of his decisions. Were it so, it would be unlawful to adopt a contrary opinion, and approved authors might be censured for not agreeing with the saint, which, by the way, the decrees aforesaid have strictly prohibited. Father Ballerini was then at liberty to part company with St. Alphonsus on some few points, when he deemed that the arguments of other approved authors pointed to conclusions at variance with his, without incurring the grave reproach of irreverence either to the saint or to the Apostolic See.

But can it be denied that the learned professor has given a handle to such an accusation by his peremptory way of putting down authorities that differ with him? In proof of this allegation, which is concerned with the form, not with the substance, of Father Ballerini's occasional disagreement with the holy doctor, the authors of the *Vindiciæ* cull from

<sup>2</sup> P. 41.

his annotations such flowers of rhetoric as the following—"This conclusion is absurd;" "wholly singular;" "imprudent;" "in defiance of reason." But, to take first the instance of the charge of absurdity given at pages 49 and 50 of the *Vindiciæ*, by completing the quotation the authors would have spared us the trouble of observing that the epithet applies to the opinion of Mazotta and Roncaglia, and not to the saint whom he praises for the clear-headedness of his solution.

Again, at pages 51, 52, and 53, where one opinion is rejected as opposed to the commonly accepted view, and another dubbed *singular*, it is Gury, not St. Alphonsus, who has to bear the brunt of the attack, for in the first instance Father Ballerini merely observes that in this case the holy doctor alleges only *Concina*, and in the second he expressly says that Gury's quotation from the saint does not justify the conclusion he has built upon it.

A little further on (pages 55 and 56), his strictures on certain arguments of Lacroix and Cardenas, which St. Alphonsus does not make use of, are numbered with the proofs of his want of reverence for the saint.

In pages 57 and 59, Father Ballerini is arraigned for having qualified a thesis of St. Alphonsus as "unheard of," as "repugnant to common sense." But it appears that the thesis in question was never taught by St. Alphonsus, who most assuredly would never have given his sanction to the doctrine that it is lawful in practice to reject an opinion of well-established and much greater probability in favour of a legal obligation, for the far less probable one on the opposite side.

But the most valid plea for the professor is the tenor of his published works. No one can be at the pains of reading them carefully, without being convinced that he is a devoted follower of St. Alphonsus, for all that he here and there notices some of those shortcomings from which no mortal, be his mental endowments never so eminent, may claim exemption. The authors of the *Vindiciæ* themselves do not hesitate to own that their sainted founder has *sometimes* been inaccurate in his quotations from standard works. Has Father Ballerini said, or insinuated, much more?

But the Roman professor fares no better at the hands of his censors when he claims fellowship with St. Alphonsus; his very agreement with his views is considered by them objectionable, as tending to distort the teaching of the saint on a fundamental point of his doctrine, and to father upon him a system at variance with that they uphold on his authority. As is well known, Father Ballerini in his dissertation on the *Systema Morale* of St. Alphonsus, claims him as a Probabilist. On the other hand, his assailants declare that he has misunderstood and misrepresented their founder, who, if they are to be believed, steered that middle course between laxity and rigorism, which they call æqui-Probabilism.

Father Ballerini's system may be thus briefly summarized: It is lawful for the moral agent to take action on an opinion favourable to

liberty or exemption from obligation, even though the opinion affirming the existence of the law be more probable, supposing always that the excess of this latter probability be not so great as to destroy the probability of its opposite. This he lays down as a principle of licit action in all cases where the existence or permanence of the law is in question, in all cases where the use of a probable opinion is not forbidden by a certain law, *e.g.*, in the administration of the sacraments, not to mention other instances.

It cannot be questioned that the holy doctor's views coincided with those Father Ballerini has attributed to him, for in the dissertations on this point, wherewith he prefaced the two Neapolitan editions of his works (1749, 1755), he adopts as his own, and establishes by proofs he considers most cogent (*validissimas*), the doctrine which favours the moderate use of a probable opinion though the opposite opinion be more certain.<sup>3</sup> In that which forms the introduction to the later edition, he is still more explicit, as the thesis he undertakes to maintain is that "it is lawful to act on a probable opinion, in the concurrence of a greater probability in favour of the law, whenever such opinion rests on certain and solid grounds;" this he holds to be far more probable than its contradictory, or to use his own words, "it is most highly probable, nay, it is morally certain."

Of the arguments he alleges on its behalf he says—"These arguments taken singly, avail to show the moral certainty of our thesis, how much more, then, when taken collectively?"

The assertion, then, that St. Alphonsus was the *creator* of a new system of morals, called *æquiprobabilism*, besides implying that until the last century the Catholic Church was at sea on a principle of wide reach and of continual application in practice, supposes that at some time or other, St. Alphonsus, who, by the way, has published his *Retractions*, those confessions of the mind which so often cost us more than the avowal of moral deviations, including Probabilism among the views he had seen fit to modify, either as to their substance or their statement. We have looked through the two lists, one containing ninety-nine, the other twenty-five amendments, without discovering the vestige of a reference to this capital point of his teaching.

But, it is urged, in the very work, the *Systema Morale*, to which appeal is made, the saint has, at least implicitly, condemned the view taken of Probabilism by the Roman professor, for he decides in the negative the question as to the lawfulness of following in practice the less probable opinion in opposition to one of higher probability in favour of the law. It must, however, be borne in mind that in his explanation of this solution, he so modifies it as to render it perfectly consistent with the system he had begun by maintaining. His own words sufficiently show that in the decision alleged, he had in view the case of a probability attaching to moral obligation unquestionably, or, as he himself explains, notably higher than that of its opposite; a

<sup>3</sup> Edition of 1749.

probability, as he fails not to observe, bordering upon, and practically equivalent to moral certainty in the less strict sense of the word, which necessarily reduces the opinion favourable to the liberty of the moral agent to a slender and doubtful probability, or in other words, is incompatible with its probability in any true sense of the term. There can be no mistake about his meaning, as he repeats this again and again throughout his works. We are thus fairly entitled to conclude that according to the mind of St. Alphonsus, lawful action cannot be taken on an opinion favourable to liberty in the concurrence of a more probable one on the side of the law, only when the greater probability of the latter eliminates or renders doubtful the probability of its opposite, which justifies the inference that when this greater probability does not wholly outweigh, or at least render the probability of the opinion favourable to liberty, more or less questionable, it is allowable to follow it in practice, since in the hypothesis its probability, though inferior, is grounded on a solid basis, whether of reason or authority. This is the identical system which is known as Probabilism in the schools; the system in developing which Father Ballerini has availed himself of the labours of the holy doctor with whom it is sought to put him in antagonism, and which he, in his turn, culled from the teachings of the master-minds to whom moral theology owes its scientific method and form.

---

### III.—REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *Louise Lateau of Bois d'Haine: her Life, her Ecstasies, and her Stigmata.* A Medical Study by Dr. F. Lefèbvre. Translated from the French. Edited by Rev. J. Spencer Northcote, D.D. Burns and Oates, London, 1873.

As the learned author observes in his Preface, the Catholic Church is supposed by her adversaries to be ever on the look out for supernatural manifestations, for miracles, visions and revelations of the Lord. The necessary result of this conviction is, that when the Church courts or commissions inquiry into the reality and genuineness of facts of this description, and decides in favour of them, their affirmative conclusions are discredited *à priori* as biassed and foregone. This should not surprise us, since on this point the issue, as between the Church and her antagonists, is but indirectly concerned with particular facts or statements, it primarily involves a principle. It stands to reason that there can be no ground for a mutual understanding between those who, with the coryphæi of what is called modern science, assume as self-evident the impossibility of any deviation from the laws of nature, of any direct communication with the Unseen; and those who, in conformity with the mind of the Church, believe that the action of natural forces may be, and is, from time to time, suspended with a view to the far more important needs and interests of the moral order, and that our fellowship with the

company of many myriads of angels and with the spirits of the just made perfect is occasionally evidenced by extraordinary manifestations. We deem it a mere waste of time to do more than call attention to the Arcadian simplicity of the popular Protestant view, which, with a most refreshing innocence of logic, denies the possibility of any supernatural occurrence subsequent to the closing of the canon of the New Testament. A masterly *exposé* of it may be found in Mr. Lecky's *History of Rationalism*. It is foreign to our present purpose to go beyond the mere statement of the principles respectively held in this matter by the Church and her antagonists, yet may we observe that the Catholic standpoint is far more favourable to a searching and judicial investigation of facts claiming to derive from causes above nature, to the sacred interests of truth, and to the detection of error and imposture, than the sweeping negation of the Rationalist, who too often forgets that assumption is not proof.

The volume before us is a compendious yet exhaustive report of the medical study of a case which has excited much public attention within the last four or five years. The author, a distinguished professor in the Faculty of Medicine at the Catholic University of Louvain, was commissioned by the ecclesiastical authorities of the diocese of Tournai to investigate, from the standpoint of science, the case of Louise Lateau. This selection was justified, not only by his professional eminence and intellectual and moral qualities, but by the experience he has acquired in dealing with nervous affections and mental diseases during the fifteen years and more that he has had the direction of two establishments for lunatics. We will allow him to sum up in his own words the result of his studies and observations, continued beyond eighteen months—

"1. A young girl, placed under our observation, presents two important phenomena: the first consists of a flow of blood, which takes place every Friday, and never appears on the other days of the week, which shows itself always upon the same places, on both sides of the feet and hands, on the left side of the chest, on the forehead, and all round the head. The second phenomenon is an ecstasy, during which the functions of the senses are suspended and the soul is present at religious scenes, of which she retains the clearest remembrance on returning to ordinary life.

"I have watched these phenomena for almost two years; thousands of witnesses, among them about a hundred of medical men, and more than two hundred theologians have also seen them. Their *existence* is therefore proved in the most certain manner.

"2. It was not sufficient to demonstrate the reality of these extraordinary facts; it was necessary to prove that they are genuine and true. By observing the moral conditions in which the phenomena take place, studying by the light of pathological physiology the laws which govern hæmorrhages and nervous affections, and by submitting the young girl to various tests, I have proved that the hypothesis of a

fraud must be entirely laid aside. We next sought the causes which preside over the origin of these extraordinary facts. Studying in the first place the question of hæmorrhages, I proved that the periodical bleedings of Louise Lateau belong to none of the species of hæmorrhage admitted within the regular limits of science; that they can be compared with none of the extraordinary cases recorded in the annals of medicine, and finally, that the laws of pathological physiology do not enable us to explain their cause.

"Entering next upon the character of the ecstasy, I retraced the characters of those classic nervous affections which appear to present some traits of resemblance with the ecstasy of Louise Lateau; and I think I have demonstrated that it is impossible to connect it with any of the nervous affections now known. I penetrated into the domain of the occult sciences; those obscure doctrines have supplied no more assistance for the interpretation of the facts at Bois d'Haine than the more honest sciences which flourish in the open sunshine. Lastly, pursuing the subject still more closely, I compared the ecstasy of Louise with the different states known by the name of natural ecstasy. It appears to me that I have furnished documents of some importance towards the solution of the problem.

"I now conclude my task."<sup>1</sup>

With a view to insure the utmost accuracy attainable, Dr. Lefèbvre made himself thoroughly acquainted with the domestic history of Louise Lateau and her surroundings. As we gather from the opening chapter of his Report, she was born in 1850 of poor but respectable working people, and her whole life, bating a brief term of schooling, has been spent in domestic cares, and in the unceasing struggle for daily bread. Her mental characteristics, as given by her biographer, are by no means brilliant. She is not imaginative, but may be described as a person of good sound common sense without smartness, without enthusiasm. Among her moral qualities, the doctor, after having submitted her to frequent and searching tests, places first her straightforward truthfulness, and her almost transparent simplicity. Her piety, though fervent, is free from affectation and exaggeration. If she may ever be said to have stepped out of the beaten track of the common work-a-day world, it was by devoting herself to the care of the family of a poor labouring man stricken with cholera and abandoned through the selfish fears of those on whom they had the greatest right to rely. Though but a child of sixteen, she nursed the dying man and his wife, prepared their bodies for burial, and continued her assistance to their daughter, who was also struck down by the fearful pestilence, until the brothers, shamed, it may be hoped, by the contrast of such courageous devotedness, acted a more natural part. Her physical temperament and constitution, as well as that of her mother and sisters, have been submitted by Dr. Lefèbvre to no less searching a scrutiny than her mental capacity and moral character, yet without betraying the least tendency to any

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 161, 162.



scrofulous or nervous affections, which might help to trace to natural causes the extraordinary phenomena of which she is the subject.

It was on Friday, April 24, 1868, that the young girl first discovered that blood was oozing from the left side of her chest, a phenomenon which was repeated on the following Friday, with the additional circumstance of a flow of blood from the feet; the third Friday, May 8, blood escaped for the first time from the backs and palms of the hands, and finally, on the 25th of the following September, it oozed for the first time from her forehead. It was on the thirteenth Friday after the first appearance of the stigmata, that her weekly ecstasies began, though certain passing raptures had, from time to time, been observed.

Her conduct at the beginning of these marvellous occurrences speaks well for her discretion; she kept them secret as long as she could from all, save the guide of her conscience, who at first made light of them, and compelled her not to allow her imagination to dwell thereon. When it was no longer possible to keep the facts secret, his first step was to direct her to a physician.

As for the stigmata themselves, from Saturday till Thursday morning, all that is to be seen are small surfaces of a pinkish-white colour, on the backs and palms of the hands, and on the upper surface and the soles of the feet. The symptoms of the approaching efflux of blood present themselves every Thursday, usually toward noon. A small vesicle or blister rises on the pink surfaces heretofore mentioned. In the night-time the vesicle bursts and the blood begins to ooze from the bare derma, or real skin, as distinguished from the epidermis, the outer, or scarf-skin.

This description applies also to a wound or stigma in the left side of the chest. The bleeding of the head is not preceded by the formation of any vesicles. A band of the width of two fingers' breadth, encircling the head, and passing across the forehead at an equal distance from the eyebrows and roots of the hair, would cover the bleeding circlet, which is slightly swollen. The twelve or fifteen bleeding points round the forehead appeared, when examined with a microscope, as slight abrasures of the outer skin. It must be borne in mind that the impressions on the forehead are not lasting; after Friday, these bleeding points cannot be recognized. These stigmata, both during the formation of the vesicles and the actual bleeding, are very painful, for by observing the features, the position and movements of the girl when not in ecstasy, the doctor is satisfied that she suffers acutely.

On the Saturday the stigmata are dry and shining, without the least trace of suppuration, and Louise, who the day before suffers intensely, when obliged to stand or to use her hands, is enabled to resume her usual work at an early hour of the morning.

The ecstasy in Louise Lateau constitutes one sole indivisible fact with the stigmatization which we have hitherto exclusively noticed. In separating them, Dr. Lefèbvre has merely sought to facilitate the criticism of the phenomena he was commissioned to investigate. It

may not be wholly superfluous to observe here that ecstasy is a term of very wide extension, as will appear from its genetic definition. Setting aside mere absence of mind resulting from the concentration or absorption of the mental powers in one object (negative ecstasy), positive ecstasy, or ecstasy in the strict sense, takes place when an objective influence seizes on the powers of the soul, and exerting over them the dominion which in the normal state belongs to the will, stimulates them to an activity transcending the ordinary, or even natural sphere and degree of their exercise. This influence existing, as the term ecstasy sufficiently implies, without and beyond the domain of consciousness, may be either the blind, unconscious force of nature acting on the nervous system, the dynamic influence of the spirits of the bottomless pit, as instanced in demoniacal possession, or that of the divine will which penetrates the whole of man's being, and has unlimited control over each of his powers, not excepting his will, so far forth as its motions are indeliberate, and without the circle of moral responsibility. Hence, ecstasy may be either natural or supernatural, demoniacal or divine, a division which, in its essential elements, is to be found in St. Augustine's treatise.<sup>2</sup>

The question submitted for solution to the Louvain professor was to a certain extent negative in substance and form, he had to trace to a natural cause (if any), the periodical trances of the young girl; in plainer terms, he was to decide whether these ecstasies, the reality of which he had placed beyond all rational doubt, were the manifestation of any of those affections of the nervous system which are invariably the more or less direct cause of those states designated both by medicine and theology as natural ecstasy. We have given his solution in his own words; his extended experience, his deep researches into the archives of medical practice, reveal no cases presenting even a slight analogy with these extraordinary facts. He has thus cleared the ground for an ulterior question as to the nature of the objective influence these phenomena may be taken as manifesting. This, as he is the first to acknowledge, goes beyond the terms of his commission, and the competency of merely human science. The diocesan authority, ere formulating a decision on a confessedly delicate and difficult point, will not fail to summon to its aid theological science and the experience of those well versed in the dealings of God with privileged souls, as is the wont in all such cases.

---

2. *Letters of Father Henry Walpole, S.J.* (executed at York, 17th April, 1595), from the original MSS. at Stonyhurst College. Edited, with notes, by Augustus Jessopp, D.D. Fifty copies printed for private circulation. Norwich, 1873.

No one who has ever read Sir Walter Scott's *Fair Maid of Perth* can have forgotten the battle between the champions of the Clan Chattan and the Clan Quhele. The cry of the brave "Torquil of the Oak" long lingers on the ear. The foster-father of Hector MacIan, the Chief of the

<sup>2</sup> *De Genesi ad litteram*, l. 12.

Clan Quhele, calls to his stalwart sons, "Another for Hector!" and one by one the brothers meet death for the sake of their Chief.

There was a finer sight than this, or than any that loyalty and clanship, or any human motive could show, when the priests faced the penal laws of Elizabeth and of James, in order that the Catholic religion in England might not die. Then, a young man left his quiet home in a college or religious house in some Catholic country, and knowing what was before him, when his Superiors gave the word he came to preach and minister the sacraments in holes and corners in England. He carried his life in his hand. Even in that little knot of people that heard his Mass there might be a traitor. Among those whose confessions he heard there might be a spy, by whom his name and whereabouts would be betrayed to statesmen who were as unscrupulous as they were able, and who used all their power and skill to exterminate the Catholic religion. The result of capture was "the question," too often on the rack, by which the prisoner was driven, if possible, to criminate both himself and others of the crime of being a priest on English soil, or of having harboured such a priest. The spy's trade was not to be spoilt by his appearance as a witness in a court of justice, and any trifle was counted evidence enough for the conviction of a priest. The sentence that followed was the penalty of high treason, a death so painful and ignominious that the delicacy of our time will not permit us to write that which then was spoken in open court, and and executed in the face of day and before thousands of spectators. And this went on in England for a long century, from 1577, when Cuthbert Maine, the proto-martyr of the Seminaries, met his death at Launceston, to 1681, when Oliver Plunket, the gentle and heroic Archbishop of Armagh, closed the list of our martyrs at Tyburn.

It must have cost more than it cost Torquil of the Oak, for the brave and good men who had the charge of the Seminaries and Novitiates, where the future martyrs were trained, to see them go forth to win their palms and remain themselves in safety. But there was an eagerness for the conflict on the part of the students that shows that they must have needed the curb rather than the spur. When the usual oath of the Pontifical colleges was first taken by the students of the English College at Rome, the noble spirit of Ralph Sherwin, Campion's fellow-martyr, led him to add to the clause that when his studies were completed, he would be ready, at the bidding of Superiors, to go on the English mission, the words, *hodie potiusquam cras*—"to-day rather than to-morrow."

Such a man was Henry Walpole. An English country gentleman of position and wealth, he left all to serve God in the Society of Jesus. Three years he had spent at Cambridge and four in London studying law. The Inns of Court were at that time the "hotbeds of Popery." It is worthy of remark that it was among the students of the Universities and the young lawyers that the old religion lingered longest. Henry Walpole was twenty-six when he was admitted into the Society by

Father Aquaviva, in 1584, and he was engaged for nine years in the various spiritual duties of a Jesuit before he was permitted by his Superiors to expose his life in England. He had no sooner landed than he was seized, and after being cruelly racked fourteen times during an imprisonment of sixteen months, he was hanged, drawn, and quartered at York, April 17, 1595, a young man of thirty-seven.

It is plain from the way in which he was spoken of by those who knew him personally, that he was a man who greatly endeared himself to his companions. Perhaps no one of the martyrs of that time is mentioned more affectionately, unless it be Father Campion or Father Southwell. For instance, Father John Gerard describes himself as greatly comforted when imprisoned in the Tower, at finding himself confined in the cell where Father Henry Walpole was imprisoned before him. He was indeed of too tender a nature, of too delicate a fibre, to have been well-chosen to fight with such beasts as Topcliffe the priest-catcher, or Norton the rack-master. That a man of his temperament should have borne the sight of the rope, the knife, and the fire, and have remained steadfast through the long butchery of his execution is a triumph of the grace of God.

We get some insight into the nature of such a man by his letters. In this, it is true, we are not fortunate. Nearly seventy of his letters are preserved amongst the manuscripts at Stonyhurst, but they are preserved, not so much because they are characteristic effusions of his heart, written in confidence to an intimate friend, as because they were sent to Rome and were there preserved, when his holy death had given them the character of sacred relics. But it is not possible that so many letters should exist and not tell us something of the nature of the man who wrote them; and these speak of an affectionate, loving soul, that thought more of others than of himself. He wrote from the Escorial a farewell letter to the English College at Seville, before he undertook his journey, as he calls it, *hacia aquel reyno peligroso donde salen nuestros capritos*—"to the perilous country whence come our young ones of the flock." The same affectionate name for the lads of the College, *capritos*—"kids," he uses again, *A todos los capritos mis hermanos y hermanicos mil y mil saludes, a los quales aguardase in Ynglaterra, o si Dios sera servido, en el sielo*—"To all the little ones, my brothers and my baby brothers, a thousand salutations, whom I shall meet in England, or if it be God's will, in heaven." The other letters, with one exception, are in English. In this that we have quoted, which was written to the learned Father Peralta, the Rector of the College, he avails himself of another tongue, that can hardly be rendered into English.

The letters of Father Henry Walpole, have been edited with unusual care by the Reverend Augustus Jessopp, D.D., head master of the Royal Grammar School at Norwich. The pains bestowed upon them demands our warmest acknowledgments, and the labour has not been in vain. This edition of these letters is a perfect storehouse of information, drawn chiefly from the unprinted documents of the Public

Record Office and the British Museum. The help that is here afforded, and the example set, to those who are interested in the history of the persecution of the English Catholics, may be imagined from the fact mentioned by Dr. Jessopp in his Introduction, that "out of two hundred names mentioned in these letters, scarcely five or six have quite baffled" him. A good Index has been wisely added.

Dr. Jessopp is a clergyman of the Church of England, and, he says, to our profound regret, that between the Jesuit Fathers, to whom he owes his access to the originals of these letters, and himself, "there is, and must remain, a great gulf fixed." We will hope better things. No man can answer for what "must remain," when the grace of God is at work and the intercession of the saints.

There is a simplicity and honesty in his expressions of sympathy for the men who died as Henry Walpole died, that touches us deeply, and which will plead loudly on his behalf, and the cry of those who rest beneath the altar will be heard for him. He tells us that he was led to ask the authorities of Stonyhurst to permit him to copy these letters because he is engaged on "a biographical work, of which the chief personage was Father Henry Walpole." Our sense of the spirit in which the letters have been edited could hardly be more strongly shown than by our saying that, jealous as we are of the honour of our martyrs, and hard as it is for any one to do them justice whose faith is other than that for which they died, it is with pleasure and satisfaction that we look to Dr. Jessopp for a Life of our Father Henry Walpole.

With the edition of the letters, an instalment of the promised biography, we have but one fault to find. They are handsomely printed, illustrated with a photograph of one letter, which gives at once a facsimile of the martyr's handwriting and an untranscribed passage in cipher, and the whole is fully and carefully annotated; but, alas, and it is a real loss, there are but "fifty copies printed for private circulation." The spread of knowledge of the days through which our religion has passed in England is of the greatest service to us. Such a book as this collection of letters, if published, could not have failed to do good. We can then but beg Dr. Jessopp to hasten the publication of the promised biography.

- 
3. *L'Etat sans Dieu, Mal Social de la France.* Par Auguste Nicolas. Paris : Vaton, 1873.

No need to introduce one so well known by the numerous works he has written in defence of religion and social order as M. Nicolas. In the little volume before us, which serves as an introduction to the larger work—*La Révolution et l'Ordre Chrétien*—which we notice below, the author insists on the distinction to be drawn between the political and social reforms inaugurated at the beginning of the Revolutionary period in 1789, and the attempt to break with the Christian traditions of the

past, and to build up a new social order on a basis from which God, the author and sanction of law, right, and justice, of everything in a word which constitutes and hallows socialties, was studiously eliminated; an attempt which he justly credits to the Revolutionary spirit. The disfavour attaching to the *ancien régime*, on account of the evil memories which are so justly associated with it, and the popularity enjoyed by the men and measures of the opening period of the Great Revolution, the final catastrophe of which has yet to be witnessed, rendered the task M. Nicolas has set himself one requiring no small degree of courage. The mass of his countrymen, despite the lurid glare cast by recent disasters on the principles and tendencies of the Revolution, are still wont to regard '89 as an era of emancipation, and the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" as the charter, the gospel of their freedom. The author has had the boldness to show them, by an appeal to the history of these times, that the godless spirit of the Revolution is the sole cause of the frustration of the movement of reform, and of mutual conciliation between the several classes of French society, that inspired so many patriotic sacrifices, evoked such generous enthusiasm; but which, under the baleful influence of Revolutionary principles, degenerated into the mania of change merely for the sake of change, and ushered in a period of internecine strife, which, ere long, divided France into two classes, that of the victims and their murderers, and even after a lapse of nearly a century renders any stable institution an impossibility.

We agree with the author, the very fact of its being necessary to frame an apology for most obvious and elementary maxims of social science, is a sure but melancholy symptom of the deterioration of public conscience. It is too true that in the latter half of this nineteenth century of ours, a Christian people needs proof that society, the body politic, can as little as the individual dispense with God.

---

4. *La Révolution et l'Ordre Chrétien.* Par Auguste Nicolas. Paris: Emile Vaton.

This work is the voluminous complement of the shorter and earlier treatise entitled, *L'Etat sans Dieu*. The author again raises his voice, Cassandra-like, to denounce to his country the woes which menace her very existence as an independent and civilized State, unless she abjure her apostasy, and reconstruct her institutions on the firm and immovable basis of a frank recognition of the rights of God, and of the claims of religion in the political and social sphere. In the first chapter he develops the thesis of his previous work, and defends it against the charge of exaggeration which had been made against it. Quinet, an unexceptionable witness on the point, is appealed to. According to this writer, the Revolution was the abolition of religion, and naught else; and, again, the persevering attempt wholly to eliminate religion, was the supreme characteristic of the French Revolution. He meets the common objection which attributes this anti-religious fanaticism to



the passing delirium of revolutionary phrenzy, by alleging the plain words of its first solemn act, the Declaration of Human Rights, according to which, the law, for instance, is the expression of the general will, that is, of the will of the greater number. Not a word about right, justice, reason, or those essential relations of moral agents to each other, and to the body politic, which are as independent of the will of the individual and of the multitude, as the axioms of mathematics. The Revolution was but the practical carrying out on a large scale of the atheistical self-styled philosophy of the eighteenth century, the uplifting of the standard of rebellion against God, inspired, not by the fanaticism of heresy, as was the struggle to which Charles the First fell a victim, but by the fanaticism of atheism. In a word, it was true to its origin. But, as our readers are well aware, to assail the principles of '89, in a work addressed to the French public, is to run the risk of having to preach in the wilderness. The author insists, as in his former work, on the broad distinction to be drawn between the two movements which synchronized at that classical epoch, the one of reform, with the liberties it restored or conferred upon the nation, and that insurrectionary, subversive movement, proceeding from the spirit of independence and rebellion which hurried France into the abyss of anarchy. As he goes on to show, it is by confusing these two movements that the partisans of the Revolution have won for it its *prestige*, and have succeeded in fixing on their assailants the stigma of enmity to liberty, and of a covert hankering after the old *régime*, with all its abuses and decrepit institutions. He next takes in hand the strictures on *L'Etat sans Dieu*, in the name of modern Liberalism. Discriminating between political Liberalism, as he terms the consistent defence and vindication of civil liberty, of public order, and of constitutional right, and what he styles dogmatic Liberalism, he defines the latter by its general characters, and shows that its fundamental principle of the complete neutrality of the State in all moral and doctrinal questions, not only when rendered imperative by circumstances, but as a formula of universal application, is a compromise between truth and error, in which the latter seizes the lion's share. We call the attention of our readers to this section, which contains warnings which are not needless within our own borders.

Having thus brought the defence of his previous work to a close, he appeals to the patriotism of his fellow-countrymen to consider with him the dangers of the present situation, and the means of escape. Among these dangers, he signalizes, with scathing eloquence, the inaction of sincere believers, in the political and social order, the extent to which society in France has been penetrated, by means of the teaching afforded by the official University, with principles the Revolution, in its latest and most hideous manifestation, applied to the very fabric of society. Though defeated, the Revolution is not yet crushed, rather is it egged on to a fresh display of the genius of destruction which is its informing principle by the secret complicity of parties, who, whatever their divisions, agree in their hatred and dread of religious influences. Yet,

while thus laying bare the cancer that is eating into the very vitals of the body politic, he insists on the duty of hope in Him "Who hath made the nations of the world capable of healing"<sup>3</sup> and salvation. He denounces despair of the destinies of his country, as unworthy of a man, a patriot, and a Christian. But what are the grounds of this hope? After insisting on the wondrous elasticity of the material resources of France, he proceeds to show that a nation, which has been inoculated for well-nigh a century with the revolutionary virus, without succumbing under the disease, must be endowed with a constitution robust enough to enable it to cast off the poison. The unquestionable influence for good and evil exercised by his country over the civilized world, seems to the author to warrant the expectation, that if God has designs of mercy on society now fast drifting into the revolutionary struggle on a scale hitherto unparalleled, He will intervene for the salvation of France. Still more readily can we go with him in his enumeration of the signs of the life that still energizes in the bosom of French society, of the works of faith and charity which proceed from her inexhaustible fecundity, the lead she still continues to take in the Catholic Apostolate. He next opens the chequered annals of his country's fortunes, and recalls the signal deliverances vouchsafed in her past, at times when, humanly speaking, her case was hopeless. He sums up this portion of his work in a luminous, and we might even say epic description, of the hair-breadth escapes from total overthrow by which the finger of Providence, despite the failure of the men to whom the country had intrusted her destinies, has inscribed on the open page of the cotemporary history of France.

The fourth chapter is the development of the author's ideas of the measures imperatively required for the salvation of France. We confine ourselves to his vigorous plea for the recognition of a self-evident fact, to wit, that the national religion of France is Catholicity, not, as he might be understood by some, as claiming for it the status of an establishment, or the bare verbal recognition which serves rather to call into question what it seemingly affirms, and as events daily taking place in Italy show, furnishes not the slightest guarantee against wholesale plunder, and insolent oppression, but by ceasing to banish it from the school, the university, the army, and public administration.

The final chapter treats of the delicate question as to the form of government best suited to France, a question which for obvious reasons we leave untouched. Yet, without departing from the neutrality in questions purely political, imposed upon us by so many urgent considerations, we call attention to his vigorous denunciation of Cæsarism, and of the centralization which despite the rapid succession of *régimes* and dynasties in France, cramps and paralyzes the national spontaneity.

<sup>3</sup> Wisdom i. 14.

5. *Le Soleil*. Par le P. A. Secchi, S.J., &c. Paris: Gauthier Villars, 1870.

Father Secchi's name stands so confessedly in the first rank among the astronomers who have devoted themselves more especially to the study of the sun, that it would be as superfluous to recommend his work as it would be presumptuous to criticize it. We content ourselves, therefore, with drawing attention to it, and remarking on the extreme beauty and delicacy of the numerous illustrations by means of which the reader is enabled to see for himself the wonderful phenomena of the protuberances, the photosphere, and the spots, which modern science has been enabled to grasp by means of photography and the analysis of the spectrum. The work is divided into three parts, dealing respectively with the structure, with the external activity of the sun, and its relation to other stars. The general aspect of the spots, the new methods of observing them, their general structure, their movement and the rotation of the sun, its atmosphere, the phenomena of the protuberances, and the corona, the spectral analysis of the solar light, the solar temperature, its origin and means of preservation—these form the heads of the chapters of the first part. The second is devoted first to the radiation of the sun's light and heat through the universe, and the chemical and magnetic action of his rays. Then follows a chapter on the system of planets, with the sun as the centre of gravitation. The third part deals, as we have said, with the relation of our sun to the rest of the stellar universe. We have thus a complete treatise on the sun, written with all that calm judicial moderation as to conclusions which become the Christian man of science. The work was originally composed in Italian, but the author has been induced to publish it in French, a language singularly fitted for the exact sciences, as well as more generally known than Italian.

---

6. *Histoire des Astres*. Astronomie pour tous. Par by J. Rambosson, Lauroat de l'Institut de France. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1874.

This work is of a more general and popular character than that of Father Secchi's, noticed above. M. Rambosson appears to be well fitted for the task of preparing a book on astronomy, which all can understand. He has been for many years the editor of a popular scientific journal in France, to which he contributed what he calls almost a course of astronomy, and he has also already published two elementary works on the subject, one of which has been officially adopted by the Minister of Public Instruction for all schools under his control. The present volume seems to leave hardly anything untouched. It gives an abstract history of astronomy to begin with, and then goes through the solar system, the sun, the several planets, giving an exhaustive chapter on each. The moon, the eclipses, and the tides, are duly considered in connection with the earth. The stars, comets,

shooting stars, meteors, and the like, are also dealt with, and the book concludes with chapters on the reckoning and division of time, on astrology, and on the harmony of astronomy with the religious spirit in antiquity. We must find a word of praise for the very beautiful illustrations.

---

7. *In the Camargne.* By Emily Bowles. Smith and Elder, 1873.

Miss Bowles has given us a very interesting story, and has skilfully availed herself of scenery with which most of her readers will be entirely unfamiliar. We have lately had from her pen an article<sup>4</sup> on a modern poem written in the Provençal dialect, the story of which is placed in nearly the same region as that of the tale before us. "The island of the Camargne, formed by the main body of the Rhone, the Petit Rhone, and the Mediterranean, and containing the huge salt lake of the Valeaires, besides smaller waters, is chiefly famous for the village of Les Saintes Maries, the traditional resting-place of St. Mary Salome, St. Mary the mother of St. James, and St. Mary Magdalene, who are traditionally said to have first evangelized the Camargne." This wild region, in many respects like a piece of North Africa which has been transported across the Mediterranean, with its farms, its barren wastes, its salt pools, the herds of savage oxen that roam over it, and the rude picturesque population who have caught so many of its characteristics, is put before us very prettily in Miss Bowles' little novel. Of course there is a love story, in which an English painter with a hollow heart wins the love of a "daughter of the soil," and nearly breaks it by his desertion. The contrast between the chapters of London life and those in which the scenery is in the Camargne itself, is very striking. We think the authoress is a little hard upon men in general, but that we imagine to be one of the newly-acquired "rights of women"—authors.

---

8. *De Divinitate et Canonicitate S. Bibliorum Generatim et Singulatim.* Tractatus Francisci Marchini, &c. &c. Turin, 1874.

We heartily welcome this new treatise, which has within a few years reached a second edition. Those whom their tastes, or the duties attaching to a holy calling, invite to the study of the Word of Life, will find therein a clear, concise, and conscientious development of the introductory theses concerning the inspiration of the sacred volumes, and the canonicity of those books which, through doctrinal prepossessions rather than consideration of sound criticism, have been made to swell the list of the Apocrypha. Like all the productions which issue from the press of Signor H. Marietti, it is carefully printed, in good clear type. It will form a valuable addition to a clerical library.

<sup>4</sup> See MONTH, vol. xix., p. 211 ("Mireille, a story of Provence").

9. *The Life of St. John of the Cross*, of the Order of Mount Carmel. London : Burns and Oates, 1873.
10. *The Life of the Blessed John Berchmans*. By Francis Goldie, of the Society of Jesus (Quarterly Series, vol. vii.). Burns and Oates, 1873.
11. *The Life of the Blessed Peter Favre*, the First Companion of St. Ignatius Loyola. By Father G. Boero (Quarterly Series, vol. viii.). Burns and Oates, 1873.

We must class these three works together, and they may well claim to be companions, not only on account of the sanctity of the lives to which they are devoted, but also on account of the patient, loving industry which has evidently been bestowed on their composition. The first, the life of the great companion of St. Teresa in her work of the reform of the Carmelite Order, is the shortest of the three, and its readers will certainly find it too short. It is based on the best authorities, especially on the work of Fra Joseph of Jesus and Mary, a Carmelite friar, who entered the order very soon after the death of St. John of the Cross, was appointed annalist, and allowed full access to all papers and documents which could help him in his undertaking. It seems that Fra Joseph's work was not altogether pleasing to his Superiors, and it was published without their sanction. Nevertheless it is perfectly trustworthy, and subsequent lives of St. John have only corrected a few mistakes as to names. The writer of the English Life has consulted whatever other authorities are within ordinary reach. It is clear also that he is familiar with the history of St. Teresa—a history with which a great part of St. John's life was inseparably interwoven. The narrative is clear and concise; many writers of the more reflective kind would have increased its bulk immensely, and, as we have already said, the only fault which we can find with it is that it might have been longer. It is thoroughly honest. The life of St. Teresa, in which we hear so much of the persecution raised against her and her associates in the reform, must have prepared the reader of this life of St. John for a good deal of matter of the same kind.

The second volume named above is very carefully and beautifully written. Father Goldie has had the advantage of an excellent predecessor in the same line of work, Father Vanderspeeten, whose "labours," he tells us, "have left nothing to be done in the way of original research as to the life of Blessed John Berchman." But the English work is not a mere compilation or translation. It is almost perfect in its kind as to a biography. Blessed John Berchman's life was short and beautiful, but it is almost unequalled as a model for the formation of a young religious. Far less marvellous and miraculous than the life of St. Stanislaus Kostka, less romantic, if we may use such a term, than that of St. Aloysius, it marches on quietly through the various stages of the novitiate and the period of studies, and its chief characteristic, that of simple completeness in the carrying out of the rules, renders it of universal application as an example.

The third life is a translation of the life of Blessed Peter Favre, the first companion of St. Ignatius, which has been lately published at Rome

by Father Boero. In some respects it is more full in detail than the life of Father Peter Favre by Orlandini, which has become almost a classical specimen of hagiology. It differs from the ordinary run of modern saints' lives in having no series of separate chapters upon the different virtues respectively, such as usually occur in books which are drawn up from processes of canonization or beatification, in which evidence as to the virtues has to be grouped under special heads for the purpose of proof. Father Boero has deliberately chosen not to follow this ordinary arrangement, although Orlandini had followed it before him, thinking that his readers will be far more pleased and edified by having set before them, as a second part of the volume, the "Memorial" or record of his private thoughts and meditations left behind him by the Blessed Peter himself. This wonderful diary has never been published till it appeared in Father Boero's translation, although lithographs of it have been for some years in circulation among the members of the Society of Jesus, to whom, of course, they have a particular value. The "Memorial" occupies nearly half of the goodly volume now before us, and although it is here and there difficult, on account of brevity, and we may add, depth of thought, we are much mistaken if it does not become a cherished possession to thoughtful Catholics.

We have on our table some splendid specimens of French illustrated works besides those of Father Secchi and M. Rambosson, which are noticed above. Foremost among these we must place Dom Gueranger's new and most sumptuous edition of his *Histoire de Ste. Cecile*—a work to which we hope to devote in a future number the space which we cannot find in this. The publishers are Messrs. Firmin Didot. Next must come M. Natalis de Wailly's glorious edition of Joinville's *Histoire de St. Louis*, and a companion volume, Geoffroi de Ville Hardouin's *Conquête de Constantinople*. These works are enough to vindicate the country and the time in which they appear from the charge of neglect of antiquity, or that of being unequal to produce works unrivalled in material beauty. We rejoice to see that the same publishers are going to give us William of Tyre, De Commynes, and perhaps Froissart, in the same style.

Among other valuable works which we are precluded from noticing in our present number on account of the importance and length of the contents of other departments in our Review, we must give the first place to the Archbishop of Westminster's *Cæsarism and Ultramontanism*, and his *Glory of the Sacred Heart*. We shall not wait to recommend at once Mr. Alexander Wood's very interesting volumes, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of London and its suburbs*. Our readers will also thank us for directing them to a small publication called *Manchester Dialogues*. The idea of the work seems to be that of a popular treatment of some of the main topics of every day controversy, such as the Pilgrimage and Miracles. We fancy that we detect the hand of a practised and eloquent theologian in these little tracts.



e  
t  
a  
n  
n  
e  
w  
e  
y  
"  
e  
d  
it  
e  
e.  
w  
of  
it

ed  
re  
r's  
rk  
ve  
xt  
*ire*  
n's  
he  
ect  
in  
ing  
the

ing  
the  
first  
sm,  
end  
*ical*  
r us  
ues.  
ent  
the  
of a



ST. JOSEPH'S  
**CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,**

50, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

---

NEW BOOKS FOR FEBRUARY.

- Cæsarism and Ultramontanism.* By the Archbishop of Westminster.  
*Life of Bishop Grant.* By Grace Ramsay.  
*Montalembert's Letter to a Schoolfellow.* Translated by C. F. Audley.  
*Wood's Ecclesiastical Antiquities of London and its Suburbs.*  
*Life of St. Alphonsus Liguori.* By a Sister of Mercy.  
*Life of St. Philip Benizi.* (Oratorian Series.)  
*Life of Right Honble. Spencer Perceval.*  
*Holland House.* By Princess Liechtenstein.  
*Life of Blessed Peter Favre.* By Fr. Bocro.  
*In the Camargue.* By Emily Bowles.  
*Chesney's Military Biographies.*  
*The Threshold of the Unknown Region.* By C. Markham.  
*Life of Archbishop Spalding.*  
*Man and Apes.* By St. G. Mivart.  
*Life of Blessed John Berchmans.* By the Rev. Fr. Goldie.  
*Histoire de la Constitution Civile du Clergè.* Par Ludovic Sciot.  
*Academic Essays.* Edited by Archbishop Manning.  
*Hosack's Mary Queen of Scots.* (New Volume.)  
*Hübner's Promenade autour du Monde.*  
*Sir A. Helps' Talk about Animals.*  
*Life of Anna Maria Taigi.* By E. H. Thompson.  
*Life of St. Bernardine of Siena.*  
*The Great Conde.* By C. Fitzpatrick.  
*Irish Emigration to America.*  
*Dr. Newman's Idea of an University.*  
*Les Familles et la Société en France.*  
*Life of Blessed Alphonsus Rodriguez.*  
*The Irish Race.* By M. l'Abbé Thébaud.  
*Dr. Newman's Historical Sketches.*  
*Butler's Wild North Land.*

\* \* Some of these Works are not yet published, and will be supplied  
when they appear.

## CONTENTS.

---

FEBRUARY, 1874.

### ARTICLES, &c. :—

1. A Catholic Congress.
2. Modern Academics. *By J. Rickaby, M.A.*
3. Studies in Biography.
  2. An Abbot in the Tenth Century. Part I.
4. On Analogy. *By R. F. Clarke, M.A.*
5. Chapters of Contemporary History.
  1. How the Third French Republic was made.
6. The Church and the Trial by Ordeal. *By R. Cardwell, M.A.*

### CATHOLIC REVIEW.

- I. Letter to the Editor on the Abyssinian Ordinations. *By the Rev. J. Jones.*
- II. Selections from Foreign Catholic Periodicals.
  1. The *Civiltà Cattolica* on the Vindiciæ Alphonsianæ and the Vindiciæ Ballerinianæ.
- III. Reviews and Notices.

---

\*\*\* *Vol. XIX. is now ready. Cases for Binding can be had at the Publishers.*

---

All advertisements to be sent to Messrs. BURNS & OATES, 17, Portman Street, W.

